

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS

*Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia*

7





# EROTIC PATHOS, RHETORICAL PLEASURE

Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios  
Makrembolites' *Hysmine & Hysminias*

by  
Ingela Nilsson

UPPSALA 2001

Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Greek presented at  
Göteborg University in 2001

## Abstract

Nilsson, I., 2001. Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure. Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine & Hysminias*. Acta Univ. Ups., *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia* 7. 329 pp. Uppsala. ISBN 91-554-4970-0.

Eumathios Makrembolites' novel *Hysmine & Hysminias* was written in twelfth-century Constantinople during the so-called Komnenian renaissance. This period was marked by an intensified interest in ancient genres, which were reconsidered from new perspectives and in some cases subjected to revival or transformation. One of the genres that was "revived" was the ancient novel, with the so-called sophistic Greek novels as models. The aim of the present study is to describe and explain Makrembolites' relation to his model, Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon*, in terms of Byzantine mimesis and modern narratology. The investigation consists of three parts: (1) a narratological analysis of *Hysmine & Hysminias*; (2) a comparative study of *Hysmine & Hysminias* and *Leukippe & Kleitophon*; (3) a discussion on imitation and transtextuality with a point of departure in the quotations of, and allusions to, ancient literature in Makrembolites' novel.

It is found that *Hysmine & Hysminias* is based on a complex strategy of repetition with variation, which contributes to the novel's poetic character. The text's strong emphasis on artistry in both painting and writing underlines the artificial structure of the novel itself. This may be seen in relation to contemporary interests, but also in connection with ancient philosophical ideas on love and the significance of art in texts such as Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe*. The relation between Makrembolites and Tatius is accordingly more complex than the model-imitation concept implies. *Leukippe & Kleitophon* is not the only hypotext of *Hysmine & Hysminias*, but a number of other ancient and Byzantine texts are used for allusions and as narrative settings. The generic mixture and the complex transtextual relations that emerge in *Hysmine & Hysminias* result from the Byzantines' knowledge of the ancient novel and the particular interest in ancient genres during the Komnenian period. The intimate literary milieu in twelfth-century Constantinople allowed elaborate intertextual games and literary subversion.

Key-words: Eumathios Makrembolites, *Hysmine & Hysminias*, Achilles Tatius, *Leukippe & Kleitophon*, ancient novel, Eros, ekphrasis, Byzantine novel, mimesis, imitation, literary subversion, Byzantine literature, Komnenian literature, intertextuality, transtextuality, spatiality.

Ingela Nilsson, Department of Classical Studies, Göteborg University, P.O. Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.

ISSN 0283-1244

ISBN 91-554-4970-0

© Ingela Nilsson 2001

Printed in Sweden

Elanders Gotab, Stockholm 2001

Distributor: Uppsala University Library, P.O. Box 510, SE-751 20 Uppsala

*To the memory of  
my mother and father*



## Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to a number of people who have helped me during my work with this book.

It was Ole Smith who first suggested that I read Makrembolites' novel, and who stimulated my interest in literary analysis. I am very glad to have experienced the period of encouragement and inspiration that Ole brought to our department; it is still strange to think that he will not be here to see the finished book.

After Ole's untimely death in 1995, Tomas Hägg helped me to elaborate my subject and encouraged me to pursue my ideas. He continued to supervise my work during the following years, and he always took his time to see me and listen to all my questions—whether in London, Groningen or Stockholm. I have benefited greatly from Tomas' wise and respectful comments, and his interest in my work has been a great inspiration to continue.

My supervisor, Karin Hult, has patiently directed the development of my work, and been a constant support through good times and bad. I am particularly indebted to Karin for helping me to prepare my manuscript for publication; I could not have made it without her experience and technical skill.

My external supervisor, Panagiotis Agapitos, has offered me plenty of challenges, criticism, and encouragement over the last five years. He has put his knowledge of Byzantium and literature at my disposal, he has offered advice and practical help—and we have had many good laughs. Less than one year ago, when things seemed hopeless, Panagiotis convinced me that I could—and should—finish the book; for this I thank him warmly.

I also owe many thanks to Beata Agrell, who has guided me for quite a few years now through the field of literary theory. Beata's vast knowledge and, above all, her great scholarly curiosity have made our co-operation very stimulating.

I am indebted to my teacher and friend Tryggve Göransson for patiently reading the successive drafts of the book, for intelligent remarks and good discussions. His sharp eye has saved me from many blunders, and his subtle irony has helped me through many dark moments.

My thanks are due also to Jan Olof Rosenqvist, the editor of the *Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia*, for accepting my thesis for publication in the series, and also for his careful proof-reading of my manuscript, which led to a number of useful comments and suggestions.

I also thank the staff of the Göteborg University Library, who have been constantly helpful, and Jon van Leuven, who has corrected my English.

I am truly grateful to other colleagues and friends who have helped me in different ways: by sending me copies of articles that I could not find, by offering advice or suggesting improvements of different kinds, or by engaging in stimulating and pleasant discussions. *Ingen nämnd, ingen glömd.*

My stays abroad have been made possible thanks to the generosity of the following funds: Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse, NorFa (Nordisk Forskerutdanningsakademi), Stiftelsen Anna Ahrenbergs fond, and Herbert och Karin Jacobssons Stiftelse. I also take this opportunity to thank the Department of Modern Greek and Byzantine Studies at the University of Cyprus, and the Department of Classics, Russian and the History of Religion at the University of Bergen, for providing me with stimulating milieus and good working conditions.

This book is dedicated to the memory of my mother and father. They taught me the patience and persistence that I needed to finish the book, and the courage that I still need in order to accept the sad fact that they are no longer here.

Göteborg, 1 March 2001

*I. N.*



# Contents

INTRODUCTION	11
The text	11
Motivation and approach	13
Research situation	15
Achilles Tatius and the ancient sophistic novel	19
The ancient novel in Byzantium	25
Method	36
1. NARRATOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF <i>HYSMINE &amp; HYSMINIAS</i>	46
1.1 Theoretical and methodological considerations	46
1.2 Analysis	48
1.2.1 Story	48
1.2.2 Composition	51
Opening of the novel 51    Advancing the plot 53    The doubling of the plot 56    Repetitions with variation 64    The closure 74	
1.2.3 Textual structure	79
Narrative 80    Description 84    Commentary 87    Narrative character- istics 90    The overall structure of the novel 92	
1.2.4 Motifs and themes	96
The garden 97    Dreaming of Eros 103    Slavery 111    Themes 123	
1.2.5 Time and space	136
Fictional time 137    Fictional space 139    Spatial time and temporal space 141	
1.2.6 Point of view	145
The narrating act 152	
1.2.7 Characterisation	154
Naming of characters 155    Repetition, reaction, accumulation or change? 159	
2. MAKREMBOLITES AND ACHILLES TATIUS:	
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	166
2.1 Theoretical and methodological considerations	166
2.2 Analysis	170



2.2.1	Story	170
2.2.2	Composition	178
	Novel and philosophy 181 Advancing the plot 186 Closure 189	
2.2.3	Textual structure	192
	Ekphraseis and dreams 193 Digressions: paradoxography and myth 197 General structure 200	
2.2.4	Motifs and themes	201
	Eros 202 The garden 209 The storm 213 The chastity test 219 The eagle 222 The mother 224 The flirting 227 Apollo and Daphne 231 The dolphin 233 The palm 235 Themes 237	
2.2.5	Time and space	239
	Fictional space 240 Eventful vs. uneventful; temporal vs. spatial? 242	
2.2.6	Point of view	243
	Restriction of view-point and psychology 245 What happened to the heroines? 246	
2.2.7	Characterisation	248
	Heroes and heroines 249 Friends and helpers 256 Mistresses 258	
3.	MIMESIS AND TRANSTEXTUALITY:	
	TRADITION AND INNOVATION	261
3.1	Allusion to ancient literature	262
3.2	Quotation of ancient literature	267
3.3	Allusion to the Christian tradition	279
3.4	Hypertext and architexts: Makrembolites, Tatius, and other texts	283
	CONCLUSIONS	287
	Appendix	291
	Summary of <i>Hysmine &amp; Hysminias</i>	291
	Summary of <i>Leukippe &amp; Kleitophon</i>	293
	Bibliography	295
	Index locorum	314
	General index	324

# Introduction

In the first part of the twelfth century, during the so-called Komnenian Renaissance in Constantinople,<sup>1</sup> a few authors took up the ancient practice of novel writing. The result, to judge from what has come down to us, was four Byzantine novels: one in prose and three in verse. The subject of this investigation is the prose novel, Eumathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine & Hysminias*. For an unprepared modern reader this novel may seem eventless and rhetorically overelaborated—indeed “Byzantine” *par excellence*—but at a closer reading it turns out to be an exciting and highly sophisticated piece of literature, a multilayered display of literary artistry. It is not my task here to defend the literary quality of *H&H*. Instead, the aim of this study is to show how the novel has been carefully composed by means of *mimesis*, conducting an intertextual dialogue with antiquity while also maintaining links with the contemporary literary scene.

In order to place the analysis of the novel in its proper cultural and literary context, this introduction will give a general presentation of the ancient novel and its place in Byzantium, and also present the cultural and literary situation of the twelfth century in which the author of *H&H* worked.

## The text

Four novels survive from the Komnenian period: Eumathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine & Hysminias* (hereafter *H&H*), Theodoros Prodromos' *Rhodanthe & Dosikles* (hereafter *R&D*), Niketas Eugenianos' *Drosilla & Charikles* (hereafter *D&C*), and Konstantinos Manasses' *Aristandros &*

---

<sup>1</sup> On the three Byzantine “renaissances”, Macedonian, Komnenian, Late or Palaiologan, see Treadgold (1984) 75–98, Ferruolo (1984), Ševčenko (1984), and Schreiner (1989); cf. Lemerle (1971) on Byzantine humanism. On the Komnenian period, see also Magdalino (1993) 382–412. For criticism of the use of the term renaissance in the Byzantine context, see Kazhdan (1995) 4–5, who uses the term “pre-renaissance” for the 11th and 12th centuries; Kazhdan argues that one should not confuse continuity with revival and renaissance, which implies a break. On renaissance as a term for the “return of a literary past”, see Jauss (1982) 35. On the 12th-century renaissance in the West, see Benson & Constable (1982).

*Kallithea* (hereafter *A&K*), the latter preserved only in fragments.<sup>2</sup> The three verse novels are all written by identifiable authors, whereas we know much less about the author of *H&H*.<sup>3</sup> There are even uncertainties concerning his name, since the manuscripts attribute the novel to varying names: Eustathios Makrembolites, Eumathios Makrembolites, Georgios Makrembolites, or Eustathios Parembolites.<sup>4</sup> A number of different titles have also been added to the name: *protonobilissimus*, *megas chartophylax*, and *philosophos*.<sup>5</sup> Makrembolites is known also as the author of a collection of riddles, preserved with keys written by Maximos Holobolos.<sup>6</sup> Attempts to identify the author of *H&H* with Eustathios of Thessalonike,<sup>7</sup> or with another Eustathios, the assumed compiler of the 'Z' version of *Digenes Akritas*,<sup>8</sup> have not proved convincing. The identification of the author is, of course, closely linked to the question of dating the work. The traditional dating of *H&H* to the late twelfth century, ca. 1180, was partly based on a letter to a certain Eumathios Makrembolites, τῷ ἐπάρχῳ κυρῷ Εὐμαθίῳ τῷ Μακρεμβολίτῃ, written by Theodoros Balsamon and with a *terminus ante quem* at 1186.<sup>9</sup> Another reason for that dating was the hypothesis that Makrembolites had drawn material from Nikephoros Basilakes (ca. 1115–1180).<sup>10</sup> The attempts to date *H&H* have, however, varied widely, even

<sup>2</sup> It is now more or less common practice to call the Komnenian texts, as their ancient predecessors, "novels", whereas the Palaiologan successors are referred to as "romances"; see e.g. Agapitos (1991) 4, n. 5 and (1999) 112, n. 5; Jeffreys (1998) 191; MacAlister (1996) 1–2. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 1, prefers to use the term "medieval Greek romance" for both periods, but cf. id. (2000), where the Komnenian novels are referred to as "novels". On the term "ancient novel", see Hägg (1983) 4. The four Komnenian novels have been conveniently gathered in one volume with Italian translation by Conca (1994a).

<sup>3</sup> For a short presentation of Prodhomos, Eugenianos, and Manasses with further references, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 70, 76, 78; Agapitos (1998a) 146–147.

<sup>4</sup> The author's name accordingly varies also in modern scholarship. For a possible biography, see Hunger (1998), and p. 18 below.

<sup>5</sup> On the different names and titles, see Hilberg (1876) vii–x; Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 764, 766; Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 556–558. For fuller and more recent discussions, see Cataldi-Palau (1980) 107, n. 2; Plepelits (1989) 1.

<sup>6</sup> Εὐσταθίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου αἰνίγματα, τοῦ δὲ Μεγάλου Πρωτοσυγκέλλου τοῦ φιλοσοφωτάτου καὶ ῥητορικωτάτου κυρίου Μαξίμου τοῦ Ὀλοβόλου λύσεις αὐτῶν, pp. 201–217 in Hilberg (1876).

<sup>7</sup> Heisenberg (1903).

<sup>8</sup> The theory was put forward by Chatzis (1930); Chatzis believed that Makrembolites was the author of the "original" *Digenes Akritas*, an idea that he later elaborated in a series of articles published in *Athina* in 1950–1952. Chatzis' theory was finally refuted by Jeffreys (1976). On *H&H* and *Digenes Akritas*, see also Tiftixoglu (1974) 60, n. 320.

<sup>9</sup> Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 766.

<sup>10</sup> Schmid (1909) 1075; refuted by Poljakova (1969).



from the seventh to the fifteenth century.<sup>11</sup> Evidence recently brought to the fore indicates that *H&H* was the first of the Komnenian novels to be written, and that *H&H* thus should be placed in the first part of the twelfth century, ca. 1135.<sup>12</sup>

*H&H* is the Byzantine novel most widely copied, with 43 surviving manuscripts ranging from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century.<sup>13</sup> It has also been widely printed and translated.<sup>14</sup> Despite the number of manuscripts, one should not make too many assumptions about the novel's popularity in its own time. The audience was probably small, limited to the literary circle of its author and other intellectuals in Constantinople.<sup>15</sup> The majority of the manuscripts date from the Renaissance, which indicates that the novel was highly appreciated during that period.<sup>16</sup> Like the contemporary verse novels, *H&H* is written in the learned, Attic style, but with a fairly simple syntax. Its simple prose with paratactic sentences and a rather limited vocabulary has provoked derogatory criticism in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>17</sup>

## Motivation and approach

The Komnenian novels were for a long time overlooked by research, in literary history as well as classical philology. Indeed, the twelfth century on the whole was considered a period of political, cultural, and economic decline, a view which by now has been at least partly rejected.<sup>18</sup> On the contrary, the cultural and literary activity in the eleventh century and during the Kom-

---

<sup>11</sup> The dating of *H&H* and the internal sequence of the novels will be discussed in further detail below, pp. 16–19.

<sup>12</sup> Agapitos (2000a).

<sup>13</sup> For the manuscript tradition, see Cataldi-Palau (1980).

<sup>14</sup> There are translations in Italian (1550, 1566, 1994), French (1559, repr. 1582, 1625, 1828, 1991), German (1573, 1599, 1610, 1663, 1989), Dutch (1652), and Russian (1965); on translations, editions and *Nachleben*, see Plepelits (1989) 76–79. An English translation by Elizabeth Jeffreys is in course of preparation, as is a Swedish one by the present author.

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion on the number of manuscripts and their relation to the novel's "popularity", see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 52 and Agapitos (1998a) 126–127; see also Agapitos & Smith (1992) 66–67. On the literary circles in 12th-century Constantinople, see p. 33 below.

<sup>16</sup> Cataldi-Palau (1980) 112. See also Jeffreys (1998) 192 on the novel's success in 17th-century Europe and its influence on the development of the French novel.

<sup>17</sup> See the comments on style in the critical notes of Hercher (1859) II, praef. xvi–xl; Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 764–765; Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 561.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. Harvey (1989); Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) esp. 14–15 on Mango (1980); Magdalino (1993).

nenian dynasty appears to have been lively and dynamic.<sup>19</sup> In recent years, an increasing interest in the novel genre has resulted in a series of translations, monographic studies, and articles,<sup>20</sup> but so far there are no comprehensive analyses of the separate novels. As for *H&H* we do have a number of studies on specific aspects, but there is no thorough and full-scale study of the literary structure of the novel, its position in the Byzantine context or its relation to ancient literature. The right time for undertaking such a study seems indeed now to be at hand, owing to the improved research situation concerning the ancient Greek novels as well as the Komnenian period and its literary production.

Two main aspects of *H&H* will be investigated here: firstly, the novel's narrative structure and also its ekphrastic and poetic character; secondly, the author's use of mimesis resulting in the novel's particular kind of dialogue with Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon* (hereafter *L&K*).<sup>21</sup> The ancient elements and their function in the new context of the Byzantine novel thus hold a central position in my inquiry. A closer investigation of the specific use of mimesis in *H&H* is needed in order to reach a deeper understanding of the nature and effect of the novel itself, and also to increase our knowledge of the Byzantine mimetic tradition in general. It should be emphasised that an apparent imitation of a text can result in something very different, and my aim is to avoid the traditional model-imitation concept, which tends to degrade the imitation.<sup>22</sup> The ancient novel was read and appreciated in the twelfth century, but the imitation of ancient literature was never quite as static as used to be suggested. The new design of the novel during the Komnenian period must be seen in connection with the literary audience's expectations, and that is why we have to conduct any analysis "from within", with the cultural and literary context constantly in mind.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> On the cultural context of the 12th century, see further below, pp. 28–34.

<sup>20</sup> For a detailed description of the state of research up to 1998, see Agapitos (2000b). The conference in Berlin in April 1998, "Der Roman im Byzanz der Komnenenzeit", was in itself a landmark in the history of scholarship of the Komnenian novel; the papers presented at the conference are now edited by Agapitos & Reinsch (2000).

<sup>21</sup> On my use of the term "mimesis", see below, p. 43.

<sup>22</sup> See further below, pp. 23–24, 43–44.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Agapitos in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 24–29, and see also pp. 36–39 below. At the conference "Pour une 'nouvelle' histoire de la littérature Byzantine", held in Nicosia in May 2000, the conduct of research "from within" was frequently discussed and emphasised, which indicates the changing attitudes in the field; the papers of the conference will appear in 2001 as *Pour une "nouvelle" histoire de la littérature byzantine. Actes d'une colloque international* (Cahiers Pierre Belon, vol. 9), edited by P. A. Agapitos and P. Odorico.



In spite of the apparent hotchpotch of older material and traditions, *H&H* is a consistent text: it has a balanced structure and its literary elements are coherent. The text also displays a wish to communicate with the audience, particularly in its manifest use of quotations and stock material. It has already been argued elsewhere that the novel is carefully devised and structured; the question here is rather to what purpose. In my view, the only way to reach such an understanding is to investigate the techniques used by the author in constructing his narrative and establishing his relation to his hypotext.

## Research situation

Byzantine literature, and the novels in particular, were for a long time neglected and despised by literary historians as well as by Byzantinists.<sup>24</sup> The view of Byzantium as a declining end of antiquity was reflected in the view of its literature, apparent for example in the harsh judgements of *H&H* by Wilhelm Schmid: "der Roman ist das unnatürliche Produkt eines innerlich kalten und rohen, mit widerwärtiger Präntention griechische Kultur und attischen Geschmack heuchelnden Stümpers", a little later followed by "der Roman hat als eine Erscheinung des Kunstzerfalls nur pathologisches Interesse."<sup>25</sup> The similar opinions of scholars like Erwin Rohde and Karl Krumbacher were long prevalent, and the Byzantine novels were considered even more tedious and boring than their predecessors.<sup>26</sup> As late as 1967 Ben Edwin Perry, in his study of the origin of the ancient novels, refers to the Komnenian novels as "slavish imitations of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus which were written in the twelfth century by such miserable pedants as Eustathius Macrembolites, Theodorus Prodromus, and Nicetas Eugenianus, trying to write romance in what they thought was the ancient manner." He concludes: "of these no account need be taken."<sup>27</sup> The picture of the Kom-

<sup>24</sup> On the views of Byzantine literature formed by socio-cultural and political factors in the 18th and 19th centuries, see Agapitos (1991) 3–10 and (1992); on the Byzantine novels in particular, see id. (2000b) 1–3.

<sup>25</sup> Schmid (1909) 1075 and 1077.

<sup>26</sup> On *H&H* see Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 556–561, esp. 560–61; Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 764–765. See also Huet (1670) 51–52 and Dunlop (1888) 77: "indeed, in this last and feeble example of Grecian fiction, we seldom meet with an incident of which we have not the prototype in the romances of Heliodorus and Tatius." The ancient novels too were despised; see e.g. Krumbacher, *ibid.* 764 on *H&H* as "eine vergrößerte und geschmacklose Imitation der nicht sehr geschmackvollen Erzählung des Achilles Tatios von Leukippe und Klitophon".

nenian novels as mechanical imitations of the ancient novels thus persisted for several hundred years.

Herbert Hunger's article on Komnenian literature and Alexander Kazhdan's study of Niketas Eugenianos, both published in the 1960s, opened for new interpretations of the Byzantine novels' literary aspects.<sup>28</sup> In the same decade Marcello Gigante made an investigation of Makrembolites' use of ancient allusions, quotations, and *topoi*, a study which invited further investigation of the novel's use of ancient material.<sup>29</sup> When Margaret Alexiou's "reappraisal" was published in 1977, a positive view of *H&H* began to be seriously considered. Alexiou's article has been very important for the reception of the Byzantine novels, particularly for that of *H&H*. It has, of course, been of great importance to my own study.

The scholarly work conducted in the last thirty years has concentrated on two main aspects of the novel: the imagery of Eros, and the chronology of and internal relations between the twelfth-century authors. These two fields are, as we will see, closely connected. As a background to my own acceptance of the date ca. 1135, I will here give an account of the work done in this field.

The more recent datings of the novel range from the 1070s to the early thirteenth century.<sup>30</sup> The traditional dating to ca. 1180<sup>31</sup> was first refuted by S. V. Poljakova, who argued that Basilakes had been drawing on Makrembolites, and not the other way around, as had been argued earlier.<sup>32</sup> She also suggested an influence of *H&H* on the French *Roman de la Rose* (ca. 1230).<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Perry (1967) 103. Similar views are displayed in one of the most widely read textbooks of Byzantium, Mango (1980) 237: "it is true that the four specimens we possess are unbelievably tedious, but we are not now concerned with their slender literary merit."

<sup>28</sup> Hunger (1968); Kazhdan (1967); Alexiou (1977) 24.

<sup>29</sup> Gigante (1960); Alexiou (1977) 24.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. the early datings referred to by Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 766, "vom 7. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert", and the theory of Chatzis (1930), which places Makrembolites in the 15th century; see above, p. 12, n. 8.

<sup>31</sup> See above, p. 12.

<sup>32</sup> Poljakova (1969); cf. above, p. 12 and n. 10. Poljakova emphasised that conclusions regarding the chronological relation should be based exclusively on thematic and lexical correspondences and differences. She went on to investigate by the same method the relation between *H&H* and *R&D* (1971), and came to the conclusion that also Prodhomos (ca. 1100–1170) had drawn material from Makrembolites' novel and that *H&H* therefore must be placed in the late 11th or early 12th century. I have read Poljakova (1969, 1971, 1976) and (1979) 89–124 in an unpublished Swedish translation; other references to Russian scholarship can unfortunately not be given.

<sup>33</sup> Poljakova (1976). In this article Poljakova argued that the common features of the two texts regarding theme, composition and description, and the cultural impact of Byzan-



Carolina Cupane perceives the relation between East and West differently, and she argues for an influence in the opposite direction: that Makrembolites' novel was influenced by Western erotic imagery.<sup>34</sup> Cupane's analyses are based primarily upon the imagery of *Eros basileus*, Eros the king (or the emperor), in the novel, in which she sees a Western influence. She now dates *H&H* to some time after 1166.<sup>35</sup>

In contrast to the date suggested by Cupane, Karl Plepelits has argued for a very early dating of *H&H*, the 1070s. His argument was based on an identification of Makrembolites with John Doukas, brother of emperor Constantine X Doukas (1059–1067) and friend of Michael Psellos.<sup>36</sup>

Suzanne MacAlister placed the novel in the first part of the twelfth century. She proposed a circle of intellectuals working under Anna Komnene, a circle where commentators of Aristotle as well as novelists like Makrembolites, Manasses and Prodromos might have participated.<sup>37</sup> She also argued for the internal sequence Makrembolites—Prodromos—Eugenianos.<sup>38</sup>

When Paul Magdalino's article on the imagery of Eros was published it seemed that *H&H* could finally be firmly placed in a mid-twelfth-century context, more exactly in the early period of Manuel I Komnenos, ca. 1145–1150.<sup>39</sup> Magdalino's dating was combined with MacAlister's suggested in-

---

tium on the Latin world in the first third of the 12th century, supported the theory that the author of the *Roman* had been influenced by Makrembolites.

<sup>34</sup> Cupane (1974, 2000); see also ead. (1978, 1987). Cupane (1974) did not argue that Makrembolites was influenced by the *Roman de la Rose*, as indicated by Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) esp. 80–81 and Magdalino (1992) 198; the text she investigated alongside *H&H* was the *Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors*, a French text of the late 12th or early 13th century. One may add that no possible common source for *H&H* and the *Roman* has come down to us.

<sup>35</sup> Cupane (2000) 54; cf. Cupane (1974).

<sup>36</sup> Plepelits (1989) 1–6. The novel's addressee Charidoux is, according to Plepelits, the "real" author, who upon decipherment of this pseudonym turns out to be a Doukas (-doux) with the first name Johannes (chari-). Since *H&H* according to Plepelits depicts in a biographical spirit "an earthly man's way to a monastic quest", he places the *terminus post quem* of the novel at the monastic consecration of John Doukas, probably a few years after the accession to the throne of Michael VII in 1071. Plepelits' interpretation has not met with much sympathy; see e.g. the review by Cupane (1992).

<sup>37</sup> MacAlister (1990, 1996); see also ead. (1994a, 1994b).

<sup>38</sup> MacAlister (1991); cf. Poljakova (1971).

<sup>39</sup> Magdalino (1992); on Manuel I, see also id. (1993). As the title of his article suggests ("Eros the King and the King of Amours"), Magdalino's analysis is based on the same aspect of the novel as is Cupane's, namely the imagery of Eros. Magdalino persuasively showed how the representation of *Eros basileus* together with the eroticism of *H&H* reflects the image of the βασιλεὺς ἐρώτων, the young Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180), who apparently enjoyed being represented as an amorous emperor, at least during the first years of his reign.



ternal sequence by Panagiotis Agapitos, adding Manasses in the end.<sup>40</sup> However, the recent rediscovery of “new” evidence indicates that *H&H* after all was written in the first part of the twelfth century.

It was Elizabeth Jeffreys who in two articles first brought our attention to a dedicatory poem in one of the manuscripts of Prodhomos’ *R&D* (*Palatinus graecus* 43).<sup>41</sup> In the dedication, “Theodoros, the son of Prodhomos” presents a copy of *R&D*, illustrated by himself, to the *caesar*. In the second of her two articles, Jeffreys drew three main conclusions: (a) the dedicatee of the poem is Nikephoros Bryennios, who was *caesar* from 1108/1111 to 1138; (b) the illustrator mentioned in the poem is most likely Prodhomos himself; (c) the poem was part of a dedicatory frontispiece illustrated by the author himself and presented to his patron Bryennios. Accordingly *R&D* must be dated to before 1138.

The poem has recently been reedited and discussed by Agapitos, who argues that the illustration mentioned in the poem is not an actual illumination; instead it is a way of referring to the novel of Makrembolites, by using the painter/painting imagery that is well developed in *H&H*.<sup>42</sup> This hypothesis can be combined with Hunger’s recently proposed biography, which identifies the author of *H&H* with the imperial dignitary Eumathios Makrembolites who became *eparchos* of Constantinople twice, and signed the acts of the 1166 synod as *protoasekretis*.<sup>43</sup> Makrembolites could have written the novel while he was a notary at a young age, ca. 1130–1135, before starting his career in the imperial administration.<sup>44</sup> If we accept the hypotheses of Hunger and Agapitos, *H&H* was the first of the Komnenian novels to be written.

Although the conclusions of Hunger and Agapitos seem convincing, it is probable that the last word has not yet been said about the dating of the novels. We must bear in mind that the field is comparatively new and still

<sup>40</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 148. The fragmentary novel of Manasses was left out of MacAlister’s discussion.

<sup>41</sup> Jeffreys (1998, 2000).

<sup>42</sup> Agapitos (2000a). On the artistic imagery in *H&H*, see below, esp. pp. 130–135.

<sup>43</sup> Hunger (1998) esp. 4–8; Agapitos (2000a) 184–185. A funerary epigram was dedicated to this person by Theodoros Balsamon (epigr. 13): *εἰς τὸν τάφον τοῦ σεβαστοῦ κυροῦ Εὐμαθίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου*, see Horna (1903) 182–183 (text) and 206–209 (commentary). Cf. the letter by Theodoros Balsamon that was used to date *H&H*; Krumbacher (1897<sup>2</sup>) 766 and above, p. 12. A number of lead seals that can be ascribed to the same person, and that are datable to the second half of the twelfth century, survive; see Hunger, *ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the title in manuscript G (*Cod. Barb. gr.* 29) f. 3<sup>r</sup>: *ποίημα Εὐμαθίου νωταρίου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου τῶν καθ’ Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν*; Agapitos (2000a) 184–185.

under investigation. The Symposium on the Komnenian novels in Berlin in 1998,<sup>45</sup> and the number of papers on the Byzantine novels at the International Conference of the Ancient Novel in Groningen 2000,<sup>46</sup> showed that the interest in the Komnenian novels is growing, and that they are no longer generally neglected or despised.

### Achilles Tatius and the sophistic novel

Since the first International Conference on the Ancient Novel in 1976 (ICAN 1),<sup>47</sup> we have seen a growing interest in the ancient Greek novel, and a number of studies on different aspects have appeared.<sup>48</sup> We now know of a number of texts belonging to the novelistic tradition,<sup>49</sup> but traditionally we speak of five ancient Greek novels: Chariton's *Chaereas & Kallirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesos' *Ephesiaka*, Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon*, Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe*, and Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*. These five novels are usually divided into so-called non- or pre-sophistic and sophistic novels; Chariton and Xenophon belong to the first group, Tatius, Longus and Heliodoros to the second. The term "sophistic" derives from the intellectual movement in the Roman Empire known as the Second Sophistic, and does not imply any particular degree of sophistication apart from the distinct stylistic characteristics of the period. We will here concentrate on the sophistic novels, since they were the Byzantines' primary models. We should, however, note that the dialogue between Tatius and the non-sophistic kind of novel is similar to that between Makrembolites and Tatius. That is, the borrowing of certain elements that are reused in a new context, along with

---

<sup>45</sup> See Agapitos & Reinsch (2000).

<sup>46</sup> For abstracts of the papers presented at the conference, see Zimmermann, Panayotakis & Keulen (2000); the proceedings of the conference are expected to appear in 2002.

<sup>47</sup> See Reardon (1977).

<sup>48</sup> There is a still growing number of good studies on the ancient novel; see e.g. the general studies by Billault (1991), Bowie (1985), Fusillo (1991), Hägg (1983), Holzberg (1986), Konstan (1994), Perry (1967), and Reardon (1971, 1991). See also the bibliography in Schmeling (1996). There is an on-line bibliography on the ancient novels and related genres, continuously supplemented with new works and managed by Jean Alvarez and the Petronian Society, at

<http://www.chss.montclair.edu/classics/petron/PSNBIB/FMBIB.HTML>.

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. the narratives translated in Reardon (1989), including several fragments of lost novels. For the fragments, see Stephens & Winkler (1995). See also the texts discussed in Morgan & Stoneman (1994), Tatum (1994), and Schmeling (1996).



intertextual links to other literature, is characteristic of both Tatius and Makrembolites.<sup>50</sup>

The Second Sophistic movement (roughly the first to the fourth centuries A.D., at its first height in the second)<sup>51</sup> received its name already in its own time, when Flavius Philostratus described it in the first book of his *Lives of the Sophists*.<sup>52</sup> The *Lives* consist of a number of short biographical sketches, presenting not only the main characters involved, but also the centres of the sophistic art and stylistic trends. The title “sophist” was officially given to professional, often travelling, teachers of rhetoric since the reign of Nero, a period that marked a beginning of a philhellenic attitude on the part of the Roman government. The national revival triggered by Nero’s Greek tour and his declaration of liberty for the Greek states (A.D. 67) led to a flowering of cultural activity in the cultural and economic centres of western Anatolia. Even though the period may be best known for its rhetoric and the sophists, who came to enjoy an especially high social prestige in the second century A.D.,<sup>53</sup> it should be remembered that the cultural movement included the whole field of *paideia* (perhaps best translated as “culture” rather than education), that is, also philosophy, music, sculpture, architecture, and athletics.<sup>54</sup>

It is, however, the rhetorical field that is most interesting to us. A Second Sophistic implies a First Sophistic, represented by the rhetors of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. In their dialogue with the ideal authors of the past, such as Thucydides, Plato, and Demosthenes, the writers of the Second

<sup>50</sup> For an analysis of the different “voices” in the ancient novels, see Fusillo (1991); on Tatius, see esp. pp. 97–107.

<sup>51</sup> On the Second Sophistic in general, see Bowersock (1969) and Anderson (1993). Bartsch (1989) sets Tatius and Heliodoros against sophistic practice; see also Anderson (1990).

<sup>52</sup> Philostratus treats both the older (starting with Gorgias of Leontini) and the newer sophists. He describes the Second Sophistic as ἡ δὲ μετ’ ἐκείνην [σοφιστική], ἣν οὐχὶ νέαν, ἀρχαία γάρ, δευτέραν δὲ μάλλον προσρητέον, “the sophistic that followed it [sc. the old], which we must not call ‘new,’ for it is old, but rather ‘second’” (*Lives*, 1.481). Cf. Bowersock (1969) 9, who argues that the movement was indeed a distinctive growth of the high empire; “it would not have been a senseless man to call it new.” The *Lives* were written some time before 238 AD. There is still some confusion as regards the Philostrati; Flavius wrote the *Lives* and the *Vita Apollonii*, and it seems that his son-in-law Lemnius (“the Elder”) is the author of the first *Imagines*, and the grandson of this man (“the Younger”) is the author of the second *Imagines*. For a more detailed discussion, see Anderson (1986) 291–296 (appendix 1); on Flavius and his work, see Dihle (1994) 340–346. One may note the novel-like features of Flavius’ *Vita Apollonii*; see Bowie (1994b) and Hägg (1983) 115–116.

<sup>53</sup> Dihle (1994) 340.

<sup>54</sup> Anderson (1993) 8–9.

Sophistic adopted not only the themes, but also the language: the period is marked by a strong Atticism, which was also a reaction against the so-called Asianism, a florid style of oratory developed in the period after Demosthenes.<sup>55</sup> In their search for the ideal form and style, the rhetoricians wrote handbooks which were to become models for more than a thousand years: besides the manuals on correct Attic, the collections of rhetorical exercises called *progymnasmata* (προγυμνάσματα).

Four collections of these “preliminary exercises” have come down to us: those by Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonios, and Nikolaos, dating from the first to the fifth century.<sup>56</sup> The handbooks describe fifteen different exercises of which *ekphrasis* (ἑκφρασις; description) and *ethopoeia* (ἠθοποιΐα; character study) are the most well-known.<sup>57</sup> The exercises were practised in schools to prepare the students for rudimentary skills in composition. The handbooks served as guidelines regarding content and procedure, suggesting order and proper topics. It was by exercising different kinds of discourse and style from the beginning of his education that a writer gained his skill, and this is probably also how our novelists refined the art of storytelling.<sup>58</sup> The “acute self-awareness, unrepentant artificiality, the pursuit of stylistic effect” that John Morgan describes as markers of the movement certainly apply to the three sophistic novels.<sup>59</sup>

In the context of this study, the importance of the Second Sophistic for the Byzantine period must be emphasised. It is the cultural and literary—and also the economic—link between the Classical and Hellenistic world and the Byzantine empire.<sup>60</sup> That link made possible the transmission of the ancient heritage to Byzantium. There are also similarities between the Hellenism of the Second Sophistic and the cultural revival of the Komnenian period: above all the fruitful dialogue with the Greek literary heritage, which

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. 86–100.

<sup>56</sup> On the dating, see Clark (1957) 179–180, but cf. Kennedy (1983) 56–60. There is also a collection of examples by Libanios from the 4th century, but it contains no theoretical discussion and is therefore usually not seen as a handbook.

<sup>57</sup> The others are: myth (μῦθος), narration (διήγημα), ethical maxim (χρεία), maxim (γνώμη), constructive reasoning and refutation (κατασκευὴ καὶ ἀνασκευή), commonplace (κοινὸς τόπος), encomium and invective (ἐγκώμιον καὶ ψόγος), comparison (σύγκρισις), thesis (θέσις), proposal of a law (νόμον εἰσφορά), and dramatisation of character (προσωποποιΐα); English terms according to Bartsch (1989) 8, n. 6. On *progymnasmata* from a strictly rhetorical perspective, see Cizek (1994) 227–319.

<sup>58</sup> On *progymnasmata*, sophists and the novels, see Bowie (1982); Bartsch (1989) esp. 14–15; Anderson (1993) esp. 156–170; Dihle (1994) 131–134, 236–240.

<sup>59</sup> Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 5.

<sup>60</sup> Millan (1964) 174.



resulted in the sophistic and the Komnenian novels.<sup>61</sup> The reason for the similarities in the two cultures is the educational system. The rhetorical exercises, for example, continued to be used in the schools of the Hellenic East through the Byzantine period.<sup>62</sup>

The audience of the ancient novel has been widely discussed. While the novels were still held in low esteem it was suggested that the audience consisted mainly of women and perhaps other uneducated people.<sup>63</sup> Now that our knowledge of the texts has improved we are able to evaluate them differently, and there are several articles on the subject.<sup>64</sup> Since our main interest here lies in the sophistic novels, we will look only at their readership, actual and intended.<sup>65</sup> There is no evidence of the reading of the novels in their own time apart from the papyri that have come down to us. We have six papyri of *L&K*, two of the second century and four of the third, and one of the *Aithiopika*, of the sixth century.<sup>66</sup> The papyri do not differ in quality from those of more "learned" literature, and there is thus no reason to suspect a lower status of the novels.<sup>67</sup> We also know of a reader of Tatius' novel in the fifth century, the learned poet Musaeus, whose *Hero and Leander* shows an influence from *L&K*.<sup>68</sup>

It is harder to say something about the intended audience, which has to be reconstructed on the basis of the texts themselves. Considering the intricate intertextuality and Attic style of the sophistic novels, one must assume

---

<sup>61</sup> Cf. pp. 19–20 above on the relation between the non-sophistic and sophistic novel, and its similarity to the relation sophistic–Komnenian novel.

<sup>62</sup> See e.g. Kennedy (1980) 163–164. For the development of education and rhetoric from the Second Sophistic to the 12th century, see Hunger (1978) I, 92–120; Kennedy (1983). Aphthonios became the main model for the Byzantines: his book followed closely that of Hermogenes, but also included examples; Kustas (1973) 22–23.

<sup>63</sup> For a possible female reader of Antonius Diogenes' *The wonders beyond Thule*, see Bowie (1994a); on a female readership of the novels with references to earlier works, see Hägg (1994) 55.

<sup>64</sup> See e.g. Hägg (1983) 90–101 and (1994); Bowie (1994a, 1996); Stephens (1994).

<sup>65</sup> On the readership of the non-sophistic novel, see Hägg (1994); Bowie (1994a) and (1996) 95–102.

<sup>66</sup> Stephens (1994) 410. While the papyrus evidence of the *Aithiopika* is meagre, the author and his novel are mentioned in literary sources, by Socrates Scholasticus and Theodorus Priscianus in the 5th century; for references, see Bowie (1996) 94–95.

<sup>67</sup> Stephens (1994) 412–414; Bowie (1996) 93.

<sup>68</sup> See e.g. *Hero and Leander* 55–57 (cf. *L&K* 1.4.2) and 92–98 (cf. *L&K* 1.4.4). On the relation between Tatius and Musaeus, see Orsini (1968) xvi–xvii; Bowie (1996) 95, n. 24. It should be added that some of Musaeus' adaptations may derive indirectly from Nonnus, who also drew material from *L&K*. The dating of Musaeus' poem to ca. 470 is uncertain.

that the readers had a good enough education to be able to understand both the highbrow language and all the literary allusions and puns. That does not, on the other hand, exclude the possibility of less educated readers, who may have appreciated the novels on other levels.<sup>69</sup>

*L&K* can now be dated to the second half of the second century, and it is probable that the author was a native of Alexandria.<sup>70</sup> This places the novel firmly in the very centre of the Second Sophistic movement, both chronologically and geographically. The dating has, however, been subject to many questions and speculations throughout the years, and for a long time the novel was considered to be an imitation of that of Heliodoros. This opinion goes all the way back to the Byzantine era, when the polymath Michael Psellos wrote his comparison of Tatius and Heliodoros, often referred to as *De Chariclea et Leucippe iudicium*.<sup>71</sup> Psellos writes that τὸ δὲ κατὰ Λευκίππην βιβλίον οἶμαι πρὸς μίμημα ἐκείνης ἀποξέσθῃναι, "in my opinion Leucippe's book was crafted in imitation of *Chariclea*."<sup>72</sup> Modern scholars shared this opinion, and Tatius was dated to the fourth, the fifth, or even the sixth century until, in the beginning of the twentieth century, a second-century papyrus finding brought forth new evidence.<sup>73</sup> *L&K* has, probably to a certain degree owing to the idea that Tatius imitated Heliodoros, met with less sympathy than the *Aithiopika*. Along with the renewed interest in the genre Tatius has, however, been re-evaluated and his reputation has been somewhat restored.

The criticism of both *L&K* and *H&H* as slavish imitations and bad, tasteless pieces of rhetoric can be traced back to the idea that imitations are

<sup>69</sup> Hägg (1994) esp. 53–54 and Bowie (1996) 105.

<sup>70</sup> On the dating of *L&K*, see Plepelits (1996) 388–391. The only information that we have on the author derives from Byzantine sources, mainly the 10th-century *Suda*, A 4695 (there by the name Achilleus Statios). A biographical item unanimously transmitted by both manuscripts and Byzantine testimonia is, however, that he was from Alexandria. For an English translation of the passage in the *Suda*, and a discussion on the variation Statios-Tatios in the MSS, see Plepelits, *ibid.* 387. One may note the number of papyri of *L&K*, which could indicate a popularity due to the setting of the novel in the native city of the author; Bowie (1996) 93.

<sup>71</sup> The full title is Τίς ἡ διάκρισις τῶν συγγραμμάτων, ὧν τῷ μὲν Χαρίκλεια, τῷ δὲ Λευκίππη ὑποθέσεις καθεστήκατον; "What is the difference between the novels which deal with Charikleia and Leucippe?" The latest edition with an English translation and commentary is Dyck (1986): 90–99 (text), 100–118 (commentary). Here the essay will be referred to as the *Synkrisis*.

<sup>72</sup> *Synkrisis* 66; English translation in Dyck (1986) 95.

<sup>73</sup> For references, see Dyck (1986) 87, 112; Plepelits (1996) 388–390 and 391–394 on the history of the text.



always bad. This relatively modern view<sup>74</sup> may be seen in contrast to the comparison of Tatius and Heliodoros made by Psellos. To the Byzantines imitation of antiquity was something natural, and even if Psellos saw the *Aithiopika* as a model for *L&K*, that did not necessarily entail that the latter was less good; just different. The passage quoted above (*Synkrisis* 66) is well known, whereas the following passage is often passed over in silence: ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα ὁ ζωγράφος {λόγος} τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀρχετύπῳ γραφῇ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα μετήνεγκεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἀπολέλειπται, γλυκύτερος δὲ ἐκείνου τὴν φράσιν ἐστί, "the painter did not in all respects succeed in transferring the elements present in his model to his own style; but though eclipsed in other respects, his diction is sweeter than his predecessor's,"<sup>75</sup> followed by a discussion of Tatius' style. Psellos brings to the fore the similarities and differences of the two authors, and his opinion that *L&K* is an imitation is not a pejorative judgement.<sup>76</sup> Psellos judged the chronology of the two novels in literary, not historical, time, which is why his approach differs completely from that of subsequent scholars with their "the later, the worse" attitude, apparent for example in the concept that Byzantine literature was imitative and therefore necessarily boring.<sup>77</sup> A different view prevailed during the Renaissance and the Baroque, when both *L&K* and *H&H* enjoyed a great popularity resulting in the production of manuscripts, editions, and several more or less reworked translations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>74</sup> The high value placed on the original—the model—in contrast to the low value of the unoriginal—the influenced—can be traced back to the mid-18th-century interest in originality and genius; for a discussion of this tendency then and now, see Clayton & Rothstein (1991) 4–5, 12–13.

<sup>75</sup> Psellos, *Synkrisis* 67–69.

<sup>76</sup> See especially Psellos, *Synkrisis* 11–13: ἀλλ' ἑκάτερον τῶν συγγραμμάτων καὶ ἡττᾶσθαι θατέρου καὶ νικᾶν ἐκείνο παρὰ μέρος κέκρινα· κρατεῖν μέντοι γε τῷ πλείονι μέρει τὸ τῆς Χαρικλείας, "each novel defeats the other and is defeated in its turn. However, Charikleia's novel is victorious to a greater degree." Cf. also Photios' *Bibliothēke*, cod. 87: πολλὴν δὲ ὁμοιότητα ἐν τῇ διασκευῇ καὶ πλάσει τῶν διηγημάτων κτλ, "in the arrangement and structure of the plot it [sc. *L&K*] is very similar [sc. to *Aith.*] etc." On the resemblance of Tatius and Heliodoros as expressed by Photios, see Agapitos (1998a) 131.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. below, pp. 43–44.

<sup>78</sup> See above, p. 13, n. 14. Most remarkable of the "Tatian" successors is a Spanish imitation of *L&K* by the name *La historia de los amores de Clareo y Florisea y de los trabajos de la sin ventura Isea*; see Futre Pinheiro (1996) 797–798. On *H&H* and its influence on the French romance, see Jeffreys (1980). Heliodoros, owing to his strong position during the Renaissance as a stylistic model, has a long series of imitations and adaptations in the 16th and 17th centuries; see e.g. Bertoni & Fusillo (1998). On the changed view of Heliodoros in the mid-18th century, see Doody (1994). See also Doody

## The ancient novel in Byzantium

Heliodoros is now considered to have written his *Aithiopika* in the late fourth century, which makes it the last ancient Greek novel known to us.<sup>79</sup> There is then a break of about 800 years until, in the mid-twelfth century, a group of intellectuals in Constantinople take up the practice of writing novels. The break may not, however, be as drastic as it first seems, since the narrative tradition was continued in the form of, for example, apocryphal Acts and Saints' Lives. Many of the Christian writings share motifs with the novel: the emphasis on travel, ordeals and trials.<sup>80</sup> We also have a parchment finding showing that the novels were still being copied (and thus probably read and appreciated) in Egypt as late as the early seventh century.<sup>81</sup> In the same century, quotations from *L&K* and the *Aithiopika* appear in a sermon of Maximos the Confessor.<sup>82</sup> To the testimonia of this early period we can now also add the essay on the *Aithiopika* by Philip the Philosopher, probably written in fifth-century Constantinople.<sup>83</sup>

---

(1996), which aims to prove that the novel is an ancient genre which must be taken into account in modern criticism, and follows the *Nachleben* of the ancient novel until the rise of realism. Unfortunately Doody's interest in the Byzantine novels is slight, which results in an indiscriminate treatment of the Komnenian and Palaiologan novels in a lump in just a few pages (pp. 176–178). Apart from being too short and thus superficial, the passage also includes some blunders: *H&H* is, for example, mentioned as one of the "verse fictions" of the 12th century; *ibid.* 177. For an approach similar to that of Doody, see Tonnet (1996), who treats the learned novels in pp. 28–30. For both Doody and Tonnet, see the review by Beaton (1997) 237–245.

<sup>79</sup> On the dating of the *Aithiopika*, see Morgan (1996) 417–418. On the reception of Heliodoros' novel in Byzantium, see Agapitos (1998a).

<sup>80</sup> See Beck (1977) 61–62; Hägg (1983) 154–165; MacAlister (1996) 84–114. On the Gospels and Acts, see Pervo (1994, 1996); on Saints' Lives, see Perkins (1994a, 1994b). On historiography, another "narrative bridge," see Roueché (1988). On the interim period in general, see MacAlister (1996) 84–114.

<sup>81</sup> The so-called *codex Thebanus deperditus*, the lost codex of Thebes, which was found by Wilcken in 1898; Wilcken (1901). The unlucky circumstances concerning this finding are also described by Hägg (1983) 228–229. The manuscript was a palimpsest containing, under a Coptic sermon, the novel of Chariton and fragments of a lost novel, the so-called *Chione*, translated in Reardon (1989) 824–825. On the codex and a possible attribution of *Chione* to Chariton, see Reardon (1996) 314–315. On novel papyri, see Stephens (1996) and Stephens & Winkler (1995).

<sup>82</sup> Maximos the Confessor, *Serm.* 3 (PG 91.744), cf. *Aith.* 4.4.4 and *L&K* 1.5.6 (on the force of love); MacAlister (1996) 110, n. 39.

<sup>83</sup> And not, as argued earlier, in 11th-century Southern Italy; see Acconcia Longo (1991a); cf. Conca (1994a) 14, who considers it a late text; Agapitos (1998a) 128, n. 21. Text in Colonna (1938) 365–370.



In the ninth century the patriarch Photios included readings of Heliodoros and Achilles Tatius in his *Bibliothēke*.<sup>84</sup> Photios compliments Tatius on his clear and pleasant style which is a feast for the ear, but he censures his shamelessness.

ἀφοριστικαί τε καὶ σαφεῖς καὶ τὸ ἡδὺν φέρουσαι αἱ πλείσται περίοδοι καὶ τὴν ἀκοὴν τῷ ἡχῷ λεαίνουσαι. ἀλλὰ τὸ γε λίαν ὑπέραισχρον καὶ ἀκάθαρτον τῶν ἐννοιῶν καὶ τὴν τοῦ γεγραφότος φαυλίζει γνώμην ἐν πᾶσι καὶ σπουδὴν καὶ τοῖς ἀναγινώσκειν ἐθέλουσι κατὰπτυστον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιεῖται καὶ φευκ-  
τήν. (*Bibl. cod.* 87)

Most of the periods are concise, clear and pleasant, and their sound seduces the ear. But the great indecency and impurity of the ideas tarnishes the intention and efforts of the author throughout. This leads the intending reader to reject and abhor the text.<sup>85</sup>

Photios prefers the more solemn and chaste Heliodoros, but he also points to the similarities between the two novels (*Bibl. cod.* 87). A defence of the same indecency that Photios censures is expressed in a poem included in the *Greek Anthology*. In the title it is attributed to either Photios or Leo the Philosopher;<sup>86</sup> the latter is more probable considering the opinions of Photios expressed in the *Bibliothēke*.

Ἔρωτα πικρὸν ἀλλὰ σώφρονα βίου  
ὁ Κλειτοφῶντος ὥσπερ ἐμφαίνει λόγος·  
ὁ Λευκίππης δὲ σωφρονέστατος βίος  
ἅπαντας ἐξίστησι, πῶς τετυμμένη  
κεκαρμένη τε καὶ κατηχρειωμένη,  
τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, τρὶς θανοῦσ' ἐκαρτέρει.  
εἵπερ δὲ καὶ σὺ σωφρονεῖν θέλεις, φίλος,  
μὴ τὴν πάρεργον τῆς γραφῆς σκόπει θέαν,  
τὴν τοῦ λόγου δὲ πρῶτα συνδρομὴν μάθε·  
νυμφοστολεῖ γὰρ τοὺς ποθοῦντας ἐμφρόνως.

The acid taste of love combined with chastity  
is pictured in the tale of Kleitophon.

Chaster still the all-astounding heroine:

<sup>84</sup> Photios, *Bibl. cod.* 87 (Achilles Tatius) and 73 (Heliodoros). Photios also read Iamblichos (*cod.* 94) and Antonius Diogenes (*cod.* 166).

<sup>85</sup> English translation in Wilson (1994) 93–94. Similar views are expressed in *Bibl. cod.* 94.

<sup>86</sup> *Anth.* 9.203: Φωτίου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντ. εἰς τὴν βίβλον Λευκίππης· ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν Λέοντος τοῦ φιλοσόφου, “Photios patriarch of Constantinople on Leukippe’s book; but some say it is Leo the Philosopher.” Leo the Philosopher, or Leo the Mathematician, was a contemporary and friend of Photios. On his life and work, see Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 79–84; on the poem and the attribution, see Gärtner (1969) 55, n. 25.

Leukippe beaten, shaved, and much abused.  
 But, most astounding!—she endured three executions.  
 And if you too, my friend, are so inclined to chastity,  
 Ignore the incidental glitter of his style  
 And fix your mind upon the termination of the tale  
 which joins these lusty saints in whole wedlock.<sup>87</sup>

The poem is significant for the view of the reception of *L&K*, since it is the only defence of Tatius' novel that has come down to us, in contrast to the proportionately many praises of the *Aithiopika*.<sup>88</sup>

In the tenth century we find Tatius' novelistic heroes curiously integrated into a Christian context, the *Life and Martyrdom of Saints Galaktion and Episteme* in the Metaphrastes collection. Kleitophon, living in the Phoenician town of Emesa, is a rich and intelligent man, married to the exceptionally beautiful Leukippe, whose only flaw is that she is infertile. Leukippe meets a monk who baptises her, she becomes pregnant and gives birth to the "protagonist" Galaktion, who eventually meets and converts the "heroine" Episteme.<sup>89</sup>

As already mentioned, Psellos in the eleventh century held approximately the same view as Photios, although he devoted a fuller analysis to investigating the matter in his *Synkrisis*.<sup>90</sup> Psellos gives an important indication of the novels' status in the Middle Byzantine period, saying that many men, even among those who are highly educated, discuss which of the two novels to prefer.<sup>91</sup> The essay on Tatius and Heliodoros is highly significant to us, since it offers literary criticism on the ancient novel and thus gives us a partial view of the literary perception of the ancient novels in the Middle Byzantine period.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>87</sup> English translation by Winkler in Reardon (1989) 174.

<sup>88</sup> Dyck (1986) 82 suggests that the attribution to Photios may have been intended to protect the novel against ecclesiastical disapproval. Cf. the identification of Tatius and Heliodoros as Christian bishops; see below, p. 31.

<sup>89</sup> Vilborg (1955) lxxiii; MacAlister (1996) 110–111. In another *Life* in the collection, the *Life of Saint Xenophon*, passages describing a storm at sea have been drawn from *L&K*: PG 114.1024, cf. *L&K* 3.5.4, PG 114.1021, cf. *L&K* 3.3.1; MacAlister, *ibid.* 110, n. 40. Cf. also the anonymous *life* of the fictitious saint Leo of Catania, in which Heliodoros is an evil magician; see Acconcia Longo (1991b) and also Agapitos (1998a) 128, n. 22.

<sup>90</sup> See above, pp. 23–24.

<sup>91</sup> Psellos, *Synkrisis* 1–2: πολλοὺς οἶδα καὶ τῶν ἀγαν πεπαιδευμένων ἀμφισβητοῦντας περὶ τῶν δύο τούτων ἐρωτικῶν συγγραμμάτων, "I know that even many well-educated persons are in dispute concerning these two romantic novels."

<sup>92</sup> There is no model for criticism of the novel in antiquity, but cf. Photios in the *Bibliothēke*. See Dyck (1986) 81–82 on Photios and 83–85 on Psellos. Dyck, *ibid.* 83, ar-



There are frequent literary reminiscences of Tatius in the twelfth century, not only in the novels<sup>93</sup> but also in the poems of the so-called Manganeios Prodromos<sup>94</sup> and in the Grottaferrata version of the *Digenes Akritas*.<sup>95</sup> *L&K* is also commented upon by Gregory of Corinth and by John Phokas.<sup>96</sup> Eustathios of Thessalonike alludes to Tatius, but without mentioning his name.<sup>97</sup> In a twelfth-century Life by Nikolaos Kataskepenos, the *Life of Saint Cyril Phileotes*, there are quotations from *L&K* and also from the *Aithiopika*.<sup>98</sup> By this time the hagiographic genre is declining (since the eleventh century), but one of the few Lives of the twelfth century is written by Prodromos, the author of *R&D*.<sup>99</sup> It is in this century that the Byzantine "revival" of the ancient novel takes place.

What caused the revival of such a genre in the twelfth century? We need to look into the intellectual and cultural environment in more detail. The literary and cultural activities of the eleventh century had initiated a new humanism, with its interest in philosophy and academic study of law and medi-

---

gues that Psellos' essay is a defence of Heliodoros in response to an attack from certain, perhaps ecclesiastical, circles; on criticism and evaluation of the *Synkrisis*, see *ibid.* pp. 87–88. Cf. Agapitos (1998a) 133: "his essays are *per se* of little relevance for the study of the ancient novel. They are, however, of extreme importance as witnesses to what literary potential an eleventh-century Byzantine reader saw in these texts and what consequences such a reader-response might have on contemporary and subsequent literary production." On Psellos' essay and its four main points, see *ibid.* 133–137.

<sup>93</sup> See below, pp. 35–36.

<sup>94</sup> Especially in poem 45, *Εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα*; Jeffreys (1980) 478–479; see also below, p. 208 and n. 210. Manganeios Prodromos also mentions *L&K* in a poem concerning Sebastokratorissa Irene (*Marc. gr.* XI, 22, f. 64<sup>r</sup>); *ibid.* 479, n. 101. On Manganeios Prodromos and the Komnenian novel, see now Cupane (2000) esp. 35–39. For a possible biography and the dating, see Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 87–93; cf. Magdalino (1993) 494–500 with a list of the poems.

<sup>95</sup> Mavrogordato (1956) 265. For the dating of the compilation of *Digenes Akritas* to the 11th or 12th century, see Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 11; on *Digenes Akritas* as a "protoromance", see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 30–51. On the complex manuscript situation, see Trapp (1971) 11–47.

<sup>96</sup> Dyck (1986) 86 and nn. 32–33; see also Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 185–187 and MacAlister (1996) 111–112. Gregory's opinions are critical and close to those of Psellos; cf. e.g. *Synkrisis* 91–92. Phokas praises the opening ekphrasis of Tatius.

<sup>97</sup> Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Comm. ad Hom. Od.* on *Od.* 14.350; Dyck (1986) 86. Tatius is by Eustathios referred to as ὁ τὰ ἐρωτικά παίζας Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ῥήτωρ. For Byzantine testimonia after the 12th century, see Dyck (1986) 86 and n. 36.

<sup>98</sup> *Vit. Cyr. Phil.* 10.2, cf. *L&K* 1.9.4 (on wounds of love); *Vit. Cyr. Phil.* 2.6, cf. *Aith.* 4.4.4 and *L&K* 1.5.6 (on the force of love; cf. also Maximos the Confessor, *Serm.* 3, *PG* 91.744); MacAlister (1997) 110, nn. 41–42. On Kataskepenos, see Sargologos (1964) 13–15. See also below, p. 104, n. 206; p. 204 and n. 186.

cine.<sup>100</sup> The twelfth century saw a continued, or even enhanced interest in classical literature, with commentaries being written on the tragedians and other major authors, and also attempts to work within the classical genres. Antiquity had provided Byzantium with models and material throughout the Byzantine period, but in the Komnenian period ancient literature seems to have been rediscovered from new perspectives; there was a change of attitude towards ancient literature, an inclination towards assimilation and reflection.<sup>101</sup> For example, in the commentaries on Homer by Eustathios of Thessalonike and John Tzetzes, interpretations of ancient texts from a contemporary perspective were now undertaken, "more profound and varied than earlier."<sup>102</sup> Both Eustathios and Tzetzes also commented upon the tragedians and Aristophanes.<sup>103</sup> In the same century Aristotle was subjected to exegesis for the first time since late antiquity.<sup>104</sup>

There was also an element of literary innovation in the form of experimentation with ancient genres and styles. A conspicuous example is the *Timarion*, an anonymous text which can be dated with some certainty to the early twelfth century, thanks to internal evidence; the authorship is still under debate.<sup>105</sup> There is an apparent model for the *Timarion* in Lucian's *Dialogues of the dead*, but the text is in fact a generic mixture of at least two genres: the main narrative is described by one narrator as a "monologic dialogue" with roots in the philosophical dialogue, whereas the motif, the descent to the underworld, has a narrative background in Homer.<sup>106</sup> Other examples of innovative literature of the twelfth century are the so-called

<sup>99</sup> Hörandner (1974) 45; Beck (1977) 63; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 31.

<sup>100</sup> See e.g. the two major studies on the 11th and 12th centuries by Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) and Kazhdan & Epstein (1985). See also Macrides & Magdalino (1992) 118 and Magdalino (1993) 332–334. On the "revival of pagan philosophy", see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 54; cf. Agapitos & Smith (1992) 35.

<sup>101</sup> Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 136–138; Macrides & Magdalino (1992) 139–156; cf. Mango (1980) 241, 254–255.

<sup>102</sup> Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 134. On Eustathios and Tzetzes, see Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 190–204.

<sup>103</sup> See Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 135 and nn. 38–39. Cf. the renewed interest in Plato, who had been transcribed in the 9th century, but studied first in the 11th century by Psellus; *ibid.* 136.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* 135–136; MacAlister (1990) and (1996) 158–161.

<sup>105</sup> The *Timarion* has been attributed to Prodromos by Hunger (1978) II, 154; to Nicholas Kallikles by Romano (1974) 30–31; to Michael Italikos or simply to "Timarion himself" by Baldwin (1984) 28–37. Cf. Alexiou (1982/83) 30. On the text as a criticism of Byzantine society, see Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 139–140; on its literary subversion, see Alexiou, *ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> On generic mixture, *mixis*, in Byzantine literature, see Agapitos (1998b); in ancient poetry, see Cairns (1972) esp. 158–176 on mixture as "inclusion".



*Ptochoprodromika*,<sup>107</sup> the *Katomyomachia* by Prodromos, the *Christos Paschon*,<sup>108</sup> and the progymnasmata of Nikephoros Basilakes.<sup>109</sup> The powers of Eros and Tyche were subject to discussion,<sup>110</sup> and there was an interest in questions related to marriage in secular and canon law from the eleventh century onwards.<sup>111</sup> The interest in love, destiny and emotion may be seen in relation to one of the new developments in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: the introduction of individual emotions into literary texts.<sup>112</sup> An example is the personal emotions that come to the fore in the works of Prodromos.<sup>113</sup> The powers of the individual and his active role in his own life are stressed in historical works such as the *Hyle Historias* and Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*.<sup>114</sup> This cultural innovation and "originality" must, however, be seen against the background of the Komnenian dynasty.

Robert Browning's article on enlightenment and repression in the Middle Byzantine period (1975) underlined the control of thought that the Komnenian dynasty exercised. According to Browning, there was an active effort to turn young minds away from critical attitudes; the condemnation of John Italos marked the beginning of the "emasculatation" that characterised the period.<sup>115</sup> The educational system, for example, was under the control of the emperor and the patriarch.<sup>116</sup> A cornerstone of Browning's view of the

---

<sup>107</sup> On the Ptochoprodromic poems, see Eideneier (1991); Alexiou (1986, 1999). For the life and works of Theodoros Prodromos, see Hörandner (1974) 21–35; Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 87–114, esp. pp. 90 and 104 on Ptochoprodromos. For a summary of the Prodromic question, i.e. the authorship of the poems, see Alexiou (1986) 32–35 (Appendix I).

<sup>108</sup> The *Christos Paschon* is a Byzantine *cento* consisting of verses drawn from ancient tragedy, primarily Euripides. The authorship is uncertain; the manuscripts attribute the work to Gregory of Nazianzos, but it is now usually dated to the 12th century.

<sup>109</sup> Pignani (1983); for a short presentation of the progymnasmata with brief examples, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 25–27.

<sup>110</sup> See further below, pp. 54–55 (on Tyche), 206 and 208 (on Eros).

<sup>111</sup> Laiou (1992) 94–96 and (1993) 109–221; Jeffreys (1998) 195.

<sup>112</sup> Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 112–113 describe this as one of the most important changes in these centuries. Cf. Browning (1975a) 10 on Psellos; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 28; Agapitos & Smith (1992) 24–25. One may compare to the development of "realism" in the West in the 12th century; Curtius (1953) 485. On the concept of realism, see below, pp. 90–91.

<sup>113</sup> Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 112–114.

<sup>114</sup> Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39.

<sup>115</sup> Browning (1975a) 15. After Italos' condemnation there were, according to Browning, at least 25 trials of "intellectual heresy" in the age of the Komneni; *ibid.* 19. On interesting parallels in the West, see *ibid.* 19–22.

<sup>116</sup> On schools in Constantinople and the educational system, see Browning (1962, 1963); Lemerle (1971) 281–308 and (1977) 193–248; Speck (1974); Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 121–133; Magdalino (1993) 325–330, 331–382.

twelfth century is his opinion on the imitative character of Byzantine culture, which he sees as "uncreative erudition, sterile good taste."<sup>117</sup> It is, however, not necessary to see mimesis in such a sharp contrast to creativity and innovation.<sup>118</sup> Innovation in the Komnenian period was practised within given boundaries, and the significant aspect is the margin that the authors managed to create within the boundaries given by the strict tradition of mimesis, the emperor, and the Church.<sup>119</sup>

As we have seen, the ancient novels had continued to be known and read in the Christian environment following the novel's demise, and a way had been found to justify them, namely, as being pious. Both Heliodoros and Tatius were early said to have been bishops.<sup>120</sup> There is also reason to suggest that the ancient novels were subject to allegorical interpretation within the spiritual sphere.<sup>121</sup> The evidence is, however, rather scarce, since there are only two such readings, both of Heliodoros.<sup>122</sup> In my view there is a risk of overstating the Byzantine "popularity" of allegorisation and projecting it on the novels.<sup>123</sup> By this, I do not intend to exclude the possibility of allegorical readings of the novels, but to emphasise that an allegorical interpretation does not exclude other readings. In the early fourteenth century, Manuel Philes wrote about the Palaiologan romance *Kallimachos & Chrysorroë* (or an early version of it) that it could be read in three ways: allegorically (the "best" way), together with friends, or to yourself in bed.<sup>124</sup> There

<sup>117</sup> Browning (1975a) 5.

<sup>118</sup> Kazhdan (1995) 8.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Afinogenov in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 23: "within the framework of rigid genre prescriptions individual features may reveal themselves sometimes even more distinctly than in a 'free' environment." On mimesis and originality, see further below, pp. 43–44 and 166–169.

<sup>120</sup> For references, see MacAlister (1996) 109–110; see also Beck (1977) 59. It is now, in the light of the late dating of the novel, held that Heliodoros may well have been a bishop; Morgan (1996) 417–421.

<sup>121</sup> See e.g. Poljakova (1979) 43–53; Dyck (1986) 85; Plepelits (1989) esp. 29–69; Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 216–17; MacAlister (1996) 108–109; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 54.

<sup>122</sup> The defence of Heliodorus by Philip-Philagathos in the 12th century, text in Colonna (1938) 336–370, and that of Ioannes Eugenikos in the 15th century, text in Gärtner (1971) 322–325; Morgan (1996) 423. Both defend the *Aithiopika* against accusations of immorality by interpreting it allegorically. On Eugenikos, see also Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 272.

<sup>123</sup> The allegorical readings of Homer by Tzetzes do not necessarily imply that all literature was interpreted accordingly. There were also different levels of allegorical interpretation as outlined by the same author: elementary, psychological, and pragmatic; see Hunger (1954), and also a short summary in Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 134–135.

<sup>124</sup> For Philes' poem, see Martini (1896). Pichard (1956) xvi–xxiii compares *Kallimachos & Chrysorroë* with Manuel's summary of the early version. Philes believed that the



is no reason to assume that all readers up to this point read the ancient and Komnenian texts allegorically.<sup>125</sup> It has also been suggested that allegorisation of the novel was primarily intended to defend it against moral sanctions,<sup>126</sup> and in that case, which I think is most probable, there is certainly no reason to doubt the existence of other readings.

Let us return to the question of the revival. Roderick Beaton has suggested that the revival of the novel should be seen in the light of the intellectual *Angst* of Byzantine society in the late eleventh century.<sup>127</sup> The birth of the ancient novel has been explained in terms of a symptomatic reaction to a society in which individuals saw themselves as victims of chance, living in an environment where pirates did indeed threaten a safe journey across the sea.<sup>128</sup> In twelfth-century Byzantium, people lived in a "safe" Christian society, no longer spiritually searching like their Hellenistic forefathers, but Byzantium had suffered two important defeats in the late eleventh century, which may have somewhat shaken the Byzantines' feeling of safety: the defeat at Manzikert in 1071, and the loss of Sicily to the Norman conquest in the same year. Beaton thus suggested that the twelfth-century novels represent a "renewed search for individual salvation", similar to that of the first novelists and their readers.<sup>129</sup> It is, however, hard to prove that such a crisis ever existed.<sup>130</sup> The twelfth century, after the accession to the throne in 1081 of emperor Alexios I Komnenos, is marked by firm and relatively stable rule, and also by economic expansion.<sup>131</sup> As we have just seen, the twelfth century is also characterised by dynamic literary activity that, build-

---

author of the romance was Andronikos Komnenos, nephew of Michael VIII Palaiologos. For the attribution of the poem to Manuel Philes, see Knös (1962). Cf. the Western *quadrige*, often associated with Dante, according to which a Biblical text could be interpreted on four levels: literal (historical), allegorical (typological or figural), tropological (moral), and analogical (eschatological) interpretation.

<sup>125</sup> See Beck (1977) 59 on the novels as *erotica*: "the Byzantine doctors suggesting these love stories as an erotic stimulant were hardly thinking about allegory." Cf. the doctor Theodorus Priscianus who in the 5th century recommended the novels of Iamblichos and a certain Herodian, which may be a corruption of Heliodoros, as a cure for impotence; Bowie (1996) 94–95.

<sup>126</sup> Dyck (1986) 85.

<sup>127</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 9–21, 52–59; cf. Plepelits (1989), who also sees *H&H* in terms of salvation literature.

<sup>128</sup> Perry (1967); Reardon (1971).

<sup>129</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 31; see also pp. 9–10, 53–54. Cf. Kazhdan (1995) 7, who points out the growing role of provincial centres, with the result that Constantinople was losing its position as the navel of the Byzantine world.

<sup>130</sup> See the objections of Agapitos & Smith (1992) 15–25, 34–44.

<sup>131</sup> See Kazhdan (1995) 6–7, and the important study of Harvey (1989).

ing on the intellectual achievements of the eleventh century, seems too developed and sophisticated to be a manifestation of intellectual *Angst*. An interpretation of the Komnenian novel in terms of salvation literature thus underplays the role of the audience and its educational level.<sup>132</sup>

The audience in twelfth-century Constantinople is still a matter of debate. We know that there were so-called *theatra* and literary circles tied to the imperial palace, the Great Church, and magnate *oikoi*, but their actual form and function still need to be defined.<sup>133</sup> Two of the most well-known circles were those around the patronesses Anna Komnene and Sebastokratorissa Eirene. These included authors like Prodhomos, Manasses, Manganeios Prodhomos, and Tzetzes, and both are accordingly associated in part with the composition of the Komnenian novels.<sup>134</sup> While our knowledge of the respective patrons and authors is limited, the literature that has come down to us shows that the works of the period required a learned audience with a certain amount of education in order to understand the level of language and the allusions.<sup>135</sup> The literary production *per se* thus indicates the existence of literary circles as a joint frame of reference for the twelfth-century authors and their audience.

We have already discussed the Komnenian novels' relation to the West, which has been investigated by Cupane, and the consequences of her suggestions for the dating of the novels.<sup>136</sup> Cupane argues that the revival was linked to, or dependent upon, the Western courtly love tradition, the influence of Western material brought to Constantinople by the Crusaders.<sup>137</sup> The existence of contacts between East and West in the twelfth century, through the Crusades in 1096–7 and 1147, and also the trading with Pisa, Genoa, and Venice, is a fact.<sup>138</sup> The problem lies in the language-area: could

<sup>132</sup> Jeffreys (1998).

<sup>133</sup> On *theatra* and literary circles, see Hunger (1978) I: 70, 210–211; Jeffreys (1980); Mullett (1984); Magdalino (1993) 336–356 (note esp. p. 355 on the context of the novels). On the Laurentianus manuscript as supporting the existence of patronage and literary circles, see Agapitos (1998a) 127 and n. 17.

<sup>134</sup> On the Aristotelian circle of Anna Komnene, see Browning (1962) and MacAlister (1990); on that of Sebastokratorissa Eirene, see Jeffreys (1982) and Magdalino (1993) 344, 350–351, 352.

<sup>135</sup> We can accordingly not see the Komnenian novels as “popular literature”; on the question of Byzantine *Trivialliteratur*, see Beck (1975) 55 and (1977) 63; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 19; Agapitos & Smith (1992) 22.

<sup>136</sup> See above, p. 17.

<sup>137</sup> Cupane (1974, 1978, 1987); Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 18–21, 211–212; cf. Poljakova (1976) and Jeffreys (1980) on an opposite influence. In contrast to this, Pecoraro (1982) has argued for an influence by Eastern material.

<sup>138</sup> On the contacts between East and West during this period, see e.g. Ciggaar (1996).



Westerners and Byzantines communicate with each other in the twelfth century? There is a major difference between dealing with trade or ceremonial receptions, for which occasions we do know that there were interpreters, and transmitting a literary tradition. The relation of the Komnenian novels to the West will not be discussed in this study, with the exception of some general comments. It is, however, my belief that *H&H* is firmly linked to the twelfth-century cultural and literary ideas, even if the conclusions of Magdalino (1992), in view of Hunger's (1998) and Agapitos' (2000a) findings, must be questioned and reconsidered.<sup>139</sup>

It has been suggested by Agapitos that the revival of the novel should be seen against the background of three phenomena in the first half of the twelfth century: the intense scholarly and literary activities concerning drama in connection with Aristotelian exegesis, the reading of ancient novels, and the composition of rhetorical progymnasmata; the novel is thus seen as an "experimental attempt at a synthesis of these elements."<sup>140</sup> Agapitos' hypothesis is plausible in the light of the surrounding literary and cultural situation, although the procedure that he describes seems a bit too mechanical.<sup>141</sup> The Komnenian "renaissance" was a period of classicism and returning to ancient ideals. The same Atticist models that had been cherished during the Second Sophistic were admired once again; the ancient novels were read from new perspectives and the Byzantines are likely to have been attracted by their intertextual quality, which was close to their own mimesis. In the light of the literary activity in Constantinople in the twelfth century—the interest in Eros and ekphrasis, fate and fiction—the "invention" of a Byzantine novelistic genre seems almost inevitable. Scholarly activities and rhetorical exercises may have influenced the genre without conscious attempts to include them, especially through the contacts established in the literary circles.<sup>142</sup> Furthermore, as already mentioned, the break may not have been as dramatic as previously believed: the novels had continued to be read, and the Lives of the hagiographic tradition provided a narrative bridge, temporally and spatially, between the ancient and the Byzantine novel.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> See above, pp. 17–18.

<sup>140</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 145. Cf. Macrides & Magdalino (1992) 139–156 on the growing sensitivity of the intellectuals of the late 11th century as a background against which to see the revival of the novel.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Rohde's (1914<sup>3</sup>) theory of the origin of the ancient Greek novel.

<sup>142</sup> See above, p. 33.

<sup>143</sup> See above, p. 25.

Makrembolites was not unique in his imitative technique; his fellow novelists used the sophistic novels as models for their compositions as well. A conspicuous difference between *H&H* and the other twelfth-century texts is that whereas Makrembolites chose to follow the ancient practice of writing novels in prose, the others all chose to versify their works. Prodromos' and Eugenianos' novels are written in iambic trimeters, Manasses' in the Byzantine fifteen-syllable verse, the so-called *politikos stichos*.<sup>144</sup>

It is a common view that Prodromos, Eugenianos, and Manasses chose to imitate primarily Heliodoros, and that Achilles Tatius held a position in the shadow of Heliodoros as the "second-best". The *intelligentia* quarrelled, according to Psellos, about who was the most talented writer, but those whose views have been recorded all preferred Heliodoros.<sup>145</sup> But in fact the imitation of Heliodoros in the novels by Prodromos and Eugenianos is basically restricted to two formal elements: the *in medias res* opening and the third-person narration. Makrembolites, on the contrary, follows Tatius' opening with a description of a city and first-person narration. Apart from that conspicuous difference between Makrembolites and the other twelfth-century novelists, they all follow the story pattern of the ancient model, with Eros and Tyche in the centre. One of the many common elements is thus the treatment of Eros, although with varying iconography in the different novels.<sup>146</sup> Apart from the formal aspects of the opening and the viewpoint, Prodromos is indebted to Heliodoros and Tatius in about equal measure.<sup>147</sup> Eugenianos, in his turn, explicitly imitates his teacher Prodromos,<sup>148</sup> but also Longus' *D&C*;<sup>149</sup> he borrowed from the *Greek Anthology*,<sup>150</sup> and his novel

<sup>144</sup> On the use of prose vs. metre in the Komnenian novels, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 72, who suggests an influence from vernacular poetry and Western romances; see also id. (1995) 86. Tonnet (1996) 29 suggests a connection with the use of the term drama. It has been argued by Agapitos, (1998a) 146, that the change from prose into metre, introduced by Prodromos, was an attempt to restore the genre's *μεγαλοπρέπεια* (magnificence/elevation) along with the use of Heliodoros as a model.

<sup>145</sup> See above, pp. 26–27.

<sup>146</sup> *H&H* 2.7–2.11, 3.1; *R&D* 8.191–8.209; *D&C* 2.125–143; see also *A&K* fragments 8, 21, 22, 64, 95, 117. On the representation of Eros in the four novels, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 57–59. On the imagery of Eros in *H&H*, see below, esp. pp. 203–208.

<sup>147</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 70; for examples, see MacAlister (1994b) 313–316.

<sup>148</sup> The Paris manuscript gives the following dedication: *ποίησις κυροῦ Νικήτου τοῦ Εὐγενιανοῦ κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ μακαρίτου φιλοσόφου τοῦ Προδρόμου*; Conca (1990) 30.

<sup>149</sup> Kazhdan (1967); Hunger (1978) II, 133–6.

<sup>150</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 37–38; on the lyrical style of Eugenianos, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 78, n. 32.



also shows traces of *L&K*.<sup>151</sup> As for Manasses, it is hard to reconstruct the novel from the fragments.<sup>152</sup> Possibly there is an *in medias res* opening, as in the *Aithiopika*, but there seem to be elements from Tatius as well.<sup>153</sup>

From what we have seen here, *L&K* is as frequently represented in the sources and in the novels as the *Aithiopika*. Tatius was also defended by the poem in the *Greek Anthology* that was quoted above,<sup>154</sup> and the Cappadocian nobleman Eustathios Boilas had a copy of Tatius' novel in his library, but none of Heliodoros'.<sup>155</sup> There is thus no need to explain why Makrembolites chose to imitate Tatius, and not Heliodoros; there probably was no definite "number one novelist" in antiquity or in Byzantium.<sup>156</sup> For the Komnenian novelists it was a choice of what *kind* of novel to write: Tatius represented eroticism and ekphrasis, which presumably was the literary aim of Makrembolites, whereas Prodromos' novel is essentially serious and chaste, even if it also displays humour. If Prodromos' *R&D* was dedicated to Nikephoros Bryennios and Anna Komnene, it may have represented a reaction to the unchaste *H&H*.<sup>157</sup>

This study is restricted to *Hysmine & Hysminias*, i.e. the other Komnenian novels will be included only as a frame of reference and in general remarks on the literary context. The Komnenian novels are different and individual works of art, and deserve to be treated separately and not always as a group. After investigations have been made of the novels individually, comparative studies will be more fruitful.

## Method

Byzantine philologists have in general been more reluctant to take notice of new methodology than scholars of the Western Middle Ages or classical antiquity. One of the reasons for this is the Byzantinists' hesitation to see

<sup>151</sup> MacAlister (1994b) 311–12. One passage from *L&K* was adopted by both authors: *L&K* 4.1.4, cf. *R&D* 3.66–75 and *D&C* 8.151–160; *ibid.* 310–311.

<sup>152</sup> For an attempted reconstruction, see Mazal (1967) 75–159.

<sup>153</sup> See e.g. *A&K*, fr. 21; Anastasi (1969) esp. 216–222.

<sup>154</sup> See above, pp. 26–27.

<sup>155</sup> On the will of Eustathios Boilas, see Vryonis (1957); Lemerle (1977) 15–63; Mango (1980) 239–240.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. the theory of Plepelits (1989) 70–72 on Makrembolites, "Eu-stathios", as the improver of Tatius.

<sup>157</sup> On the dedicatory verses of Prodromos, see above, p. 18. On *R&D* as a response to *H&H*, see MacAlister (1991) 184–194, and Agapitos (1998a) 146.

Byzantine literature *as literature*,<sup>158</sup> but we must also bear in mind the fundamentally different points of departure: there is still so much work in the Byzantine field that remains to be done, since a number of important editions and translations are still under course of preparation, and many questions of dating and attribution are still unsolved or not even yet discussed.<sup>159</sup>

It is a common opinion among classical philologists and Byzantinists that modern theory has been developed to define modern aspects of modern literature. And one must indeed be aware of the difficulties in applying modern theory to ancient or medieval literature. It is true that modern literary theory often is based on modern works, presupposing concepts unknown to ancient or medieval writers.<sup>160</sup> However, we must not forget that some very important theoretical and methodological studies have been done in precisely the medieval field, for example the works of Hans Robert Jauss, Paul Zumthor, and Mikhail Bakhtin.<sup>161</sup> As regards the classical field, modern theory has in recent years caught the interest of many classicists, and we now have a number of studies in which ancient literature is investigated by means of modern method; the ancient Greek novel is but one example.<sup>162</sup> In the Byzantine field, the situation has changed rather dramatically in the last ten years or so, above all with the fruitful studies of Margaret Mullett. There is, however, still a certain suspicion as regards modern critical theory.<sup>163</sup>

It is important to bear in mind that the medieval texts were produced under conditions completely different from the modern ones, and that in the case of Byzantium they were firmly embedded within the rhetorical tradition. They can thus not be interpreted according to our concepts of originality and intentionality. Still, as long as one is aware of the particular situation, there is no reason why one should not resort to an eclectic use of modern method. Modern theoretical studies help to sharpen the critic's eye for

---

<sup>158</sup> See Ljubarskij et al. (1998). See also Mullett (1997) 288–289 on Byzantine concepts of literature; cf. Fowler (1982) 1–19 on definitions of literature.

<sup>159</sup> See Jeffreys in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 36–40.

<sup>160</sup> Agapitos (1991) 18.

<sup>161</sup> For a survey of the development of medieval studies during the last 25 years, see Middleton (1992).

<sup>162</sup> On ancient literature and modern critical theory, see e.g. the introduction in De Jong & Sullivan (1994) 1–26, with a useful bibliography.

<sup>163</sup> See Mullett (1990, 1992) for a survey of Byzantine “literary history”, and also ead. (1997) 1–7. For a history of the scholarly study of the Byzantine novel (mainly the vernacular romances), see Agapitos (1991) 3–10, with a discussion on modern literary theory and medieval texts in pp. 11–19.



composition and narrativity,<sup>164</sup> which are major concerns in this study. As regards theoretical schools, I have not adopted any theoretical apparatus in its entirety, but rather adopted ideas and borrowed the terms that I have found appropriate. One of the reasons for employing modern literary theory in a historical context is to find a way to define that which otherwise is hard to describe. A certain eclecticism is always necessary, since no methods can be adopted without adjustment to the material under investigation.

Opponents of modern theory often point to the risks of ahistorical analysis and lack of philological method. In answer to this, one may state that literary analysis should never be separated from the cultural context of the work under investigation. Furthermore, philologists have something in common with the theoretical approach of New Criticism, namely the emphasis on close reading (although for different purposes).<sup>165</sup> The basic method for any literary investigation is, as Tomas Hägg has pointed out, "to read the text, to note the characteristics and to try to explain the more remarkable features."<sup>166</sup>

Since the Renaissance, ancient and Byzantine literature has been seen as an entity with a declining end.<sup>167</sup> Byzantine literature has been considered imitative and thus, in general, bad.<sup>168</sup> From a modern perspective, however, it is not a literature in decline; instead it has an interesting and interacting, metatextual and metalinguistic character. It displays conscious dialogues which must have been seen as creative by its own society. In the light of this new approach<sup>169</sup> we need to underline the importance of aesthetic evaluation.<sup>170</sup> We need to combine modern methods with knowledge of the historical context, and thus achieve a more balanced and just view of Byzantine

---

<sup>164</sup> As pointed out by Agapitos (1991) 18.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. De Jong & Sullivan (1994) 4–5, and see also Mullett (1990) 267 and n. 44 with references to classicist engagement in New Criticism. On the relation philology/modernist theory, see Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 9 and 22; cf. Agapitos' response in *ibid.* 26.

<sup>166</sup> Hägg (1971a) 18.

<sup>167</sup> Also by Byzantinologists, see e.g. Jenkins (1963) and Mango (1981) 49, n. 2 with references to the then "present state of the controversy". For an interesting perspective on the classical tradition, its "legend and reality", see Bolgar (1981).

<sup>168</sup> Cf. McKeon (1952) 147: "the term imitation is not prominent in the vocabulary of criticism today. In such use as it still has, it serves to segregate the bad from the good in art rather more frequently than to set the boundaries of art." See also above, pp. 23–24.

<sup>169</sup> An approach that, it should be underlined, is no more than an approach, since it represents our own perspectives, which cannot be considered absolute or timeless.

<sup>170</sup> Afinogenov, in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 23, is one of the few who have pointed out the crucial problem of literary taste: "to put it bluntly, nobody should devote himself to serious literary analysis of Byzantine texts unless he or she *enjoys* them as pieces of art." Cf. Agapitos in *ibid.* 25.

literature.<sup>171</sup> If we cannot do that, our analysis will never stand in any proper relation to the work under investigation.

In addition to this, the study of hypotexts—in this case the ancient novels—is useful and necessary, for they are the inter- and metatexts, using stock conventions that are important for the readers of both the ancient and the Byzantine novels. This entails different levels of meaning and cycles of reader-response; hence the necessity of theoretical consideration. We need tools, and in the studies of the ancient novel narratology has proved to be useful.

#### NARRATOLOGY

The critical approach of narratology assumes a set of statements on narrative genres, primarily on the systematics of telling a story and on the structure of plot. The interest in this “science of narration” culminated in France in the 1960s, represented by scholars influenced by Russian formalism and Saussurean linguistics. Literary theory had previously been focused mainly on the functions of poetry, with exceptions such as Shklovski’s analysis of Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*;<sup>172</sup> one might, however, note that the poetic principle of Roman Jakobson applies also to prose fiction.<sup>173</sup>

Two branches of narratology developed, following the distinction between story and discourse: in Massimo Fusillo’s words, referring to Gérard Genette’s terms, the narratology of *histoire* and the narratology of *récit*. Of these two, the first branch (*histoire*) concentrates on describing narrative content and defining its functions. This approach was developed under influence of the works of the Russian formalist Vladimir Propp, mainly by A. J. Greimas and Claude Bremond. The second branch (*récit*) analyses narrative structure, its figures, viewpoints, and techniques, and had its antecedents mainly in the Anglo-Saxon school, Henry James and E. M. Forster.<sup>174</sup> Different aspects were also developed by a number of important scholars writing in German, such as Günther Müller, Wolfgang Kayser, Franz Stanzel, and Eberhard Lämmert.<sup>175</sup> This branch was developed in de-

<sup>171</sup> See e.g. Rosenqvist in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 47.

<sup>172</sup> Shklovski (1966).

<sup>173</sup> Lodge (1976). On Jakobson’s poetic principle, see below, p. 42, n. 193.

<sup>174</sup> Fusillo (1996) 280–281. Fusillo refers to *histoire* and *récit* as *story* and *plot*, a somewhat strange use of “plot”; cf. below, p. 47.

<sup>175</sup> For reprints of central articles by Müller, Kayser, and Stanzel, see Klotz (1965) and Müller (1968). For a full bibliography of these scholars, see Hägg (1971a).



tail by Genette, whose work is now probably the most influential in the field.<sup>176</sup>

A narratological approach has, as already mentioned, been applied to the study of the ancient novels for some time now, starting with Hägg's pioneering study in 1971. Hägg's approach has proven influential with other scholars of the ancient novel, and it was also partly adopted by Alexiou (1977) in her analysis of *H&H*. Of the two narratological approaches mentioned above, the first has been applied to the ancient novel by Consuelo Ruiz-Montero;<sup>177</sup> the second, structuralist approach has been adjusted and applied by Fusillo.<sup>178</sup> In the Byzantine field, narratology was adopted by Agapitos in his study of the Palaiologan romances in 1991, and Mullett used it in her study of the letters of Theophylact of Ochrid (1997). The subject of narratology and Byzantine historiography was brought to the fore in 1998, when the *Symbolae Osloenses* opened up a debate with an article by Jakov Ljubarskij. Ljubarskij underlined the usefulness of the concept of narrativity for Byzantine texts,<sup>179</sup> and the responses were positive.<sup>180</sup>

As for my own approach to narratological analysis, it is influenced by the structuralist branch, i.e. my primary aim is to investigate narrative structure and technique; narrative content is, however, not dismissed, although discussed more briefly. It is, of course, my hope that this study will also contribute to a positive view of narratology in the Byzantine field.

#### SPATIAL FORM

A number of features displayed by *H&H* may conveniently be termed *spatial*.<sup>181</sup> There are two main ways of achieving spatial form in fiction that are relevant here: either through a network of recurrent motifs expressed in discourse that delays the linear development of the story, or through a pattern of forward-and-backward movement in time that plays against the chronological development but causes an effect of contemporaneity of events, such

<sup>176</sup> Esp. Genette (1980, 1988). Genette's work is taxonomic, following the path of grammarian categories: tense, mood and voice; see further below, p. 47.

<sup>177</sup> Ruiz-Montero (1982).

<sup>178</sup> Fusillo (1991, 1996, 1997).

<sup>179</sup> Especially for texts with unknown authors; Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 8–9.

<sup>180</sup> Particularly interesting are Afinogenov's comments on formalism; Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 22–23. Afinogenov argues that the clear distinction between form and content makes formalism well suited to Byzantine studies: Byzantines could appreciate form without approving of content. See e.g. Photios and Psellos on the ancient novels, above, pp. 23–24, 26–27. The conference in Nicosia in May 2000 is another sign of the changing attitudes; see above, p. 14, n. 23.

<sup>181</sup> For a first attempt to analyse *H&H* within a spatial framework, see Nilsson (2000).

as recapitulation or anticipation.<sup>182</sup> These two ways of achieving spatial form do not exclude each other; both can be employed in the same text. Ivo Vidan describes spatial form in a way that does indeed remind us of *H&H*: "spatial form is often associated with the novel as a poem, or as a composition dominated by the recurrence and juxtaposition of verbal motifs, operative words, and key themes."<sup>183</sup>

It can of course be argued that all narrative is both spatial and temporal. Even though the notion of spatial structure is a modern concept, narratives seem always to have played on both perceptual modes.<sup>184</sup> Traditionally, ancient and medieval narrative has been conceived as mainly temporal, adhering to a chronological sequence of events. Still, already in Homer we find examples of spatialising devices such as the description of Achilles' shield. According to the definitions of spatial form, ekphrasis would be defined as a highly spatial device, since it delays the linear development of the story and at the same time, inserted into a narrative, it often contains a key motif or theme.<sup>185</sup>

The idea of spatial form was introduced by Joseph Frank, who argued in a series of articles that modern narrative technique often tends to spatialise our understanding of narrative. Frank's first article<sup>186</sup> was incited by Lessing's *Laocoon* (1766), which makes a distinction between poetry and music on the one hand, and plastic arts on the other. In spite of Lessing's clear polarisation between the temporal and spatial arts, Frank emphasised the qualities of Lessing's work as offering a new approach to aesthetic form. Frank was interested in the works of the Imagist movement (High Modernism), such as T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* and Ezra Pound's *Cantos*. He argued that this kind of poetry undermines the inherent consecutiveness of language and forces the reader to perceive the elements of the poem not as unrolling in time, but as juxtaposed in space. The same tendency could be seen in prose, for example in the works of Marcel Proust and in James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and it received, according to Frank, a particular and original development in Djuna Barnes' *Nightwood*, to which Frank devoted the main

---

<sup>182</sup> Vidan (1981) 155.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid. 133.

<sup>184</sup> See e.g. Mitchell (1980) 541–542, 563–565, and also Rabkin (1981) 80.

<sup>185</sup> On the ekphrasis and its development, see below, p. 85, n. 116. See also Mitsi & Agapitos (1991) esp. 111, n. 10.

<sup>186</sup> The first article, "Spatial form in modern literature", was published in 1945; it is reprinted in Frank (1991) 5–66 and in Hoffman & Murphy (1988) 86–100.



part of his article. Later he revised the concept of spatiality into a literary constant, not linked to modernist literature.<sup>187</sup>

Frank's article aroused interest and controversy, and became a starting-point for many new studies on the subject. If one looks back, similar thoughts also occurred parallel with, and already previous to, Frank's ideas. An early study of the interaction of time and space in the novel is Bakhtin's analysis of the so-called *chronotope*.<sup>188</sup> Bakhtin wrote his study of the chronotope in 1937 and 1938,<sup>189</sup> and he may have been influenced by the same thoughts as was Frank during the same period, although Frank came to emphasise the spatial aspects of fiction and Bakhtin the temporal ones. And Bakhtin too had read and been inspired by Lessing. "It was Lessing in the *Laocoon*," writes Bakhtin, "who first made clearly apparent the principle of chronotopicity in the literary image."<sup>190</sup>

Other scholars have, independently of Frank, touched upon the spatial aspects of narrative, among them the linguist Roman Jakobson.<sup>191</sup> Jakobson, like Frank, was influenced by experimental modernism, but his ideas had a systematic point of departure in Saussure's theory of language. Saussure considered language as a self-enclosed system of sound-images and concepts, the meaning of which is defined in terms of the differential relations within the system. Jakobson observed the internal relations of words to each other, and used this as the basis of his theory of poetic language, similar to Frank's concept of so-called *space-logic*. According to Frank, the primary reference of any word-group in a modernist poem is to something inside the poem itself, that is, the system of self-reflexive signs that constitute the text (so-called *reflexive reference*). This self-reflexiveness contains a spatial logic, a space-logic, that demands a reorientation in the reader's attitude toward language.<sup>192</sup> Such a reorientation did take place in linguistics under the influence of Saussure, and Jakobson's classical definition of poetic language incorporated the "space-logical" notion of modern poetry into a wider framework.<sup>193</sup>

<sup>187</sup> Frank (1981) and (1991) 109–132.

<sup>188</sup> Bakhtin (1981).

<sup>189</sup> It was, however, not published until 1975, after it had been completed with the concluding remarks in 1973.

<sup>190</sup> Bakhtin (1981) 251.

<sup>191</sup> For a summary of similar and parallel theories, see Frank (1981).

<sup>192</sup> Frank (1981) 231 and (1991) 14–15.

<sup>193</sup> Jakobson (1987) 62–94, first published in 1960. Jakobson's poetic principle: "the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination," i.e. the organization of words in a poem ("the axis of combination") is no longer controlled exclusively by the syntactical order of the language being used; the syn-

As already mentioned, narratives have always played on both temporal and spatial modes, and the idea of spatial form may thus be used to describe phenomena in a Byzantine novel as long as we keep in mind that the intentional effort to write spatial narrative is a much later and indeed modern idea, and that a consciously spatial narrative is different from a narrative containing spatial components.

#### MIMESIS AND TRANSTEXTUALITY

First of all, I use the term "mimesis" here as one uses *imitatio* when discussing imitation in Western literature; the Greek term was introduced in Byzantine Studies by Hunger already in the late 1960s.<sup>194</sup> I do not refer to any direct, faithful imitation of reality, whether the Aristotelian "imitation of things" or the Auerbachian "imitation of reality", but rather to an underlying pattern of literary tradition which shines through the surface of the text in form, motif and language, and which lends the literary work a referential meaning or implication: in modern terms, a pronounced *transtextuality*.<sup>195</sup>

It has already been mentioned that mimesis used to be one of the main reasons for censuring Byzantine literature; the compulsive imitation of antiquity made Byzantine literature unoriginal, uninventive, and thus uninteresting.<sup>196</sup> The nineteenth century's aesthetic standard continued to apply for most of the twentieth century as well, and it was based on two concepts: the notions of originality and intentionality inherent in a work of art.<sup>197</sup> Such concepts are, however, irrelevant for Byzantine culture, with its strong rhetorical and mimetic tradition.<sup>198</sup> Mimesis cannot be distinguished from rhetoric, and the importance of rhetoric for the understanding of Byzantine literature must not be underestimated.<sup>199</sup> The negative assessments of rhetoric have been many. To take but one example, Romilly Jenkins described it as "a strait-jacket which held its prisoners in a state of mental re-

---

tactical order is counterbalanced by the "principle of equivalence" between words, based on their inner relations of similarity or dissimilarity, synonymy or antonymy, which governs the "axis of selection".

<sup>194</sup> Hunger (1969/70). On the concept of imitation in antiquity, see McKeon (1952).

<sup>195</sup> On the term "transtextuality", which more or less corresponds to the more common "intertextuality", see Genette (1997) 1, and below, pp. 168–169.

<sup>196</sup> See above, pp. 23–24 and n. 74.

<sup>197</sup> See e.g. Jenkins (1963) 46: "the highest kinds of literary creation were beyond their [sc. the Byzantines'] achievement, and even their comprehension."

<sup>198</sup> Agapitos (1991) 11–12.

<sup>199</sup> Kustas (1970); Hunger (1981); Kennedy (1981).



tardation.”<sup>200</sup> Now, the art of rhetoric has been re-evaluated as an art and as an expression of Byzantine ideology, to a large degree thanks to the studies of George Kustas.<sup>201</sup>

After Cyril Mango’s highly negative article on Byzantine literature as a “distorting mirror” (1975), the pendulum has swung, and Mango’s view has been refuted by, among others, Alexander Kazhdan. Kazhdan argued that the Byzantine imitation of antiquity should be viewed not as a lack of creativity, but as an artistic expression.<sup>202</sup> Today, mimesis is no longer seen as a limiting concept, but as a communicative tool by means of which irony and subversion can be achieved.<sup>203</sup> Just as Byzantine art might seem to us stylised and static, but to a Byzantine was vivid and filled with meaning, the stereotyped expressions and figures in literature may not appeal to us, but contained a wide range of images, ideas, and considerations to a Byzantine reader.<sup>204</sup> This, a creative relationship to the past, is mimesis in Byzantium.

\*\*\*

The present study will be carried out according to the following arrangement. The book consists of three main sections: Parts 1–3.

Part 1 contains a narratological analysis of *Hysmine & Hysminias*, treated separately and independently, i.e. as far as possible without comparison to *Leukippe & Kleitophon*.

Part 2 treats Makrembolites’ dialogue with Tatius’ novel. The focus is on the function of the elements transposed from the one text to the other. The reason for this division is to emphasise the literary value of *Hysmine & Hysminias*, showing that it is not wholly dependent on *Leukippe & Klei-*

<sup>200</sup> Jenkins (1963) 52.

<sup>201</sup> Kustas (1970, 1973, 1995). The shift is described by Mullett (1990) 259–261. The importance of rhetoric in the Byzantine novel has been underlined by Roilos in a recent article (2000), in which he analyses the play with the conventions of progymnasmata in Prodhimos’ *R&D* (the banquet scene in book 4). Although I agree with Roilos’ emphasis on rhetoric’s, and in particular progymnasmata’s, crucial role in the Komnenian novels, I think there is a risk here of seeing the novels not as entities, but as a series of independent exercises (“self-contained parts”, or “independent samples”, as Roilos himself puts it), which I think underplays the literary and artistic qualities of the text. Cf. Agapitos (1998a) 135–136 on episodic structure in Heliodoros as understood by Psellos. On rhetoric and the ancient novel, see below, p. 170, n. 22.

<sup>202</sup> Kazhdan & Constable (1982) 114–115.

<sup>203</sup> Agapitos (1991) 12. Cf. Roilos (2000) on *amphoteroglossia*. This is also typical of postmodern literature; see John Barth’s essay on “literature of exhaustion” (1967), on which Stark (1974) esp. 1–10, 118–175. Cf. below, p. 143, n. 366 on Nabokov.

<sup>204</sup> Kazhdan & Constable (1982) 114–115.



*tophon* and that it sustains an analysis. Parts 1 and 2 share the same disposition, arranged according to narratological categories. Such a disposition necessarily entails some repetition, but it also serves to give a clear description of *Hysmine & Hysminias* as seen from different angles, and is therefore valuable.

In Part 3, mimesis and transtextuality, allusion and quotation will be examined in further detail. Problems that have been touched upon in the first part of the study will be brought into the discussion, and this part thus functions also as a summarising commentary to Parts 1 and 2.

The results are finally assessed in the Conclusions.

I quote *Hysmine & Hysminias* from Hilberg's edition (1876), reprinted in Conca (1994a). The English translation of *Hysmine & Hysminias* is by Elizabeth Jeffreys, but with a number of revisions and minor corrections of my own. These changes have most often been made in order to bring to the fore elements that are significant to my own analysis. I am very grateful to Professor Jeffreys for making her unpublished manuscript available to me. The other Komnenian novels are all quoted from Conca (1994a).

*Leukippe & Kleitophon* is quoted in Greek from Ebbe Vilborg's edition (1955). The English translation of *Leukippe & Kleitophon* is that by John Winkler in Reardon (1989).

As regards the transliteration of ancient and Byzantine names, I have adopted the now most common spelling of the ancient Greek novels and their authors (e.g. *Leukippe & Kleitophon*, and not *Leucippe & Clitophon*; Heliodoros, and not Heliodorus), but kept the more traditional Latin form for other ancient authors (e.g. Aeschylus and Nonnus). Byzantine names are transliterated according to their spelling in the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*.

## PART ONE

# Narratological Analysis of *Hysmine & Hysminias*

The purpose of this part of the study is to describe and analyse how Makrembolites handled his material, that is, the care that he devoted to narrative structure and narrative devices. This investigation will serve as a basis for the second part of the study, the analysis of Makrembolites' mimetic technique. Here I wish to focus on the particular traits and qualities of the text and to that end discuss *Hysmine & Hysminias* as an individual work, not as an "extension" of *Leukippe & Kleitophon* and ancient literature. To completely avoid references to the novelistic tradition is, however, impossible, for example in the discussions of story, motifs, and themes. These aspects will be brought up and treated in further detail in Part 2.

I will start by describing the narrative content of *Hysmine & Hysminias*, the story (1.2.1). Then I will investigate the novel's structural aspects: composition (1.2.2) and textual structure (1.2.3). Next follows a chapter on the novel's motifs and also the themes that those motifs express (1.2.4). I will then move on to narratological sub-aspects: time and space (1.2.5), point of view (1.2.6), and characterisation (1.2.7).

### 1.1 Theoretical and methodological considerations

The first step of a narrative analysis is to establish a description of the way in which a narrative text is constructed, i.e. a description of a narrative system. Concepts of narratology should be considered as tools, which are useful in that they enable us to formulate this description in such a way that it is accessible to others. Terms represent and constitute a theoretical and methodological approach; it is, therefore, of crucial importance to use an appropriate technical vocabulary to describe the constituents and techniques of a novel.

The most basic concept in narratology is, of course, that of *narrative*. The word itself has been, and still is, used in different senses, and, as Gérard Genette has suggested, some of the difficulties of narratology may be due to

this ambiguity and confusion.<sup>1</sup> Genette, whose taxonomic work has been highly influential since its appearance in the 1970s, separated three distinct notions under the term “narrative”: narrative as referring to (a) the succession of events constituting the subject of the discourse; (b) the narrative statement, an oral or written discourse undertaking to tell of an event or a succession of events; (c) the act of narrating.<sup>2</sup> Genette emphasised that analysis of narrative discourse implies a study of mutual relationships, viz. between a discourse and the events recounted, and between the same discourse and the act producing it, and he designated the three aspects of narrative by the following terms: *story* (*histoire*) for the signified or narrative content (the chronological order of the events), *narrative* (*récit*) for the discourse or narrative text itself, and *narrating* (*narration*) for the producing narrative performance.<sup>3</sup> The first aspect (story) coincides roughly with the traditional use of the term “story”—the narrated events linked together according to temporal sequence and causality; the second (narrative) with that of “plot”—a rearranged narrative discourse, in which the chronological order and causal connections may have been disrupted.<sup>4</sup>

Plot and story are considered basic narratological concepts, but despite the simple and schematic appearance, the terminology is somehow ambivalent: story borders upon subject matter or “story-stuff”;<sup>5</sup> plot, on the other hand, can be seen both as the intrigue and as the artistic arrangement of the story.<sup>6</sup> The story of *H&H* will in this study be discussed in terms of its narrative content. Plot is used only in the word’s traditional sense “intrigue”; the story’s artistic arrangement will be discussed in chapters 1.2.2 and 1.2.3.

Once a textual description has been established, one has the basis for step two: an interpretation. But as Mieke Bal points out, “an interpretation is never anything more than a proposal (‘I think the text means this’).”<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Genette (1980) 25; cf. id. (1988) 13–15.

<sup>2</sup> Id. (1980) 25–26.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 27; cf. id. (1988) 14.

<sup>4</sup> Genette’s three-layer distinction may be compared to that of Bal (1985): *fabula*, *story* and *text*, which correspond to Genette’s *story*, *narrating* and *narrative*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Genette’s *story* (1980) 27: “the signified or narrative content (even if this content turns out, in a given case, to be low in dramatic intensity or fullness of incident).”

<sup>6</sup> On the sometimes confusing use of *plot*, see e.g. Fusillo (1996) 280–281, where *histoire* is defined as *story*, *récit* as *plot*; cf. also above, n. 4 on Bal. On the minimal conditions of narrativity, see e.g. E. M. Forster (1927) 82, who concluded that “the king died and then the queen died” is a plot, whereas “... and then the queen dies of grief” is a story. On the concept of “classical” and “unclassical plot”, see now Lowe (2000) 1–99, with an analysis of the ancient novel in pp. 222–258.

<sup>7</sup> Bal (1985) 10.



This means that a careful textual description of a narrative may be useful to different people and for different purposes; we do not have to—and usually we do not—share the same interpretation of a text. Therefore this part of the study will be descriptive rather than interpretative, although I do also state my own views of the text. In order to find the tools that are proper for this particular text, I have not adopted any complete theoretical system, but borrow terms according to the needs of my investigation; their origin and my own definition are stated in each case. More detailed discussions of theoretical approach and terminology are found in the respective chapters.

## 1.2 Analysis

### 1.2.1 Story

As noted above, the story of *H&H* cannot be discussed without involving the ancient novel; the twelfth-century novelists entered a novelistic tradition that had already existed for a thousand years and that had been discussed and analysed by learned men of their own time. They drew material from the ancient novels, and in particular from those of Achilles Tatius and Heliodoros.<sup>8</sup>

The main story-line of the novel runs as follows: the hero-narrator Hysminias travels from his own city Eurykomis to another, Aulikomis, as the herald of the religious feast Diasia.<sup>9</sup> He meets and falls in love with the daughter of his host, Hysmine. After three days in Aulikomis, Hysmine and her parents follow Hysminias back to his hometown Eurykomis. When it turns out that Hysmine's parents have arranged for her to marry someone else, the couple elope on a ship bound for Syria. To calm a storm, the captain of the ship sacrifices Hysmine to Poseidon, throwing her into the sea, and Hysminias is put ashore. He is captured by pirates, who are then captured by Greeks, and he becomes a slave in a Greek city, Daphnepolis. Hysmine is saved by a dolphin and becomes a slave in another Greek city, Artykomis. After one year Hysminias travels with his master, who is the herald of a religious feast, to Artykomis. In the house where they are staying Hysminias recognises one of the slave girls as Hysmine. Her mistress Rhodope

---

<sup>8</sup> See above, pp. 35–36. See also Bakhtin (1981) 4, 5–6 on the ancient novel genre, and (1984) 106 on the nature of genre.

<sup>9</sup> Athenian festival in honour of Zeus Melichios, celebrated on 23 Anthesterion in late February/early March. The Diasia is mentioned in Aristophanes, *Nu.* 408, and included in the *Suda*, Δ 752. On Zeus Melichios, see Nilsson (1950) 411–414; on the Diasia esp. p. 412.

falls in love with Hysminias, who pretends to be Hysmine's brother; Hysmine acts as Rhodope's go-between. They travel back to Daphnepolis where, at a sacrifice, the couple's parents appear; the families are reunited and Hysmine and Hysminias are released. Hysmine's virginity is tested in Artykomis after which they return to Aulikomis where Hysmine and Hysminias marry.<sup>10</sup>

The plot is not too complicated: there are no complex sub-plots and no evident parallel action. The text does, however, contain two "stories within the story", which may well be referred to as sub-plots.<sup>11</sup> The first is the episode of Hysmine's mistress Rhodope falling in love with Hysminias: she employs Hysmine, who pretends to be Hysminias' sister, as her *mediatrix*, which enables the couple to meet as lovers (gradually evolving in *H&H* 9.12–10.8). The second is that of the advances of Hysminias' mistress: she (never mentioned by name) comes on to her slave in quite aggressive and inappropriate ways (8.16.4–8.17; 10.6.2–5; 10.8), but without any effects on the main story.<sup>12</sup> There are also a couple of minor digressions inserted into the story: the story of Apollo and Daphne (8.18) and the story of the statue and spring of Artemis (8.7.2–5).

As for the apparent lack of parallel action, one should not disregard the parallel experiences of the protagonists.<sup>13</sup> Since the main story-line is narrated exclusively from the point of view of Hysminias, the experiences of Hysmine are not reported until the end of the novel (*H&H* 11.13–16); they did, however, take place during the same time as did Hysminias' experiences. In this respect, Hysmine's story may be considered a parallel sub-line. The importance of Hysmine's experiences in the main story-line, and similarly the parallelism of the protagonists' adventures, are emphasised in the very text, when the priest of Apollo exhorts Hysmine to tell her part of the story:

Ταῦτ' εἰπόντι 'χαίροις' ὁ ἱερεὺς μοί φησι καὶ πρὸς τὴν Ὑσμίνην μετάγει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς 'παρθένε' λέγων "Ὑσμίνη, τὰ μὲν δὴ περὶ τουτοῦ τὸν νυμφίου τὸν σὸν ἔχω μαθὼν ἀπὸ γλώσσης αὐτοῦ· σὺ δέ μοι τὴν μηνοειδῆ ὀλοκύκλωσον, ἵν' ὀλόφωτον εἶη μοι τὸ διήγημα." (*H&H* 11.11.1)

'Well done', the priest said to me after my speech as he turned his eyes to Hysmine, saying, 'Maiden Hysmine, I have heard from his own tongue what befell this your bridegroom; would you now like to fill out the crescent so that the whole narrative becomes fully illuminated for me?'

<sup>10</sup> For a more detailed summary of *H&H*, see the Appendix.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 32.

<sup>12</sup> On the development of the two sub-plots, see below, pp. 150–152.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 31.



It may be noted that the image of the narrative as a crescent to be filled out by Hysmine is a central metaphor for the novel's gradual revelation of "the whole truth"; on account of that, we will return to this passage later on.<sup>14</sup>

We should also note already here that the story contains a *doubling*,<sup>15</sup> or a so-called *repetition with variation*:<sup>16</sup> the first part of the story is repeated in a new version, when Hysminias relives his own experiences through his master herald. This particular structure will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

In the story we recognise a number of novelistic constants drawn from the ancient Greek novels: the young couple falling in love, the travel motif with storms at sea, apparent death and capture by pirates, the final reunion and marriage. These constants constitute the generic plot that the Byzantine novelists inherit from their ancient predecessors. There is, however, an important variation: the story is strikingly uneventful; the emphasis lies on the emotional or mental level rather than on external action.<sup>17</sup>

The pagan setting in a late antique world ruled primarily by Eros, the workings of Tyche, and the presence of other gods (in this case Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo and Artemis) are other constants. The realistic geography of the ancient novels has, however, been replaced by an imaginary world with fictional cities.

Due to the focus on the inner level, Hysminias' falling in love with Hysmine, his awakening sexuality and emotional development would best describe the subject matter of the novel. This, along with the fictional geography of *H&H*, should be seen in contrast to the ancient novel's external adventures in the Mediterranean area.

---

<sup>14</sup> See below, pp. 246–248.

<sup>15</sup> I use the term *doubling* in a very basic sense, to define a repetition of a passage of any length within the text. Cf. Morgan (1998) on narrative doublets in Heliodoros. On repetition and doubling in the lyrical novel, see the analyses of Freedman (1963), of which the concluding chapter is reprinted in Hoffman & Murphy (1988) 191–202.

<sup>16</sup> For the expression *repetition with variation*, see Lodge (1976).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. above, p. 47, n. 5. The eventlessness of *H&H* has led to frequent criticism of the novel as "boring"; see e.g. as early as the 17th century Huet (1670) 51–52: "rien n'est plus froid, rien n'est plus plat, rien n'est plus ennuyeux: nulle bienséance, nulle vraysemblance, nulle conduite; c'est le travail d'un escolier, ou de quelque chetif sofiste, qui meroite d'estre escolier toute sa vie."



## 1.2.2 Composition

In this chapter I will describe the artistic arrangement of *H&H*: the opening, the joining together of the story's scenes and events, and the closing. In chapter 1.2.3, I will discuss the strictly textual aspects of composition: the different text-types of narrative and their internal order and frequency. The aim is that these two sections together will give a detailed description of the novel seen from slightly different angles.

Despite the apparently simple plot, *H&H* does contain disruptions of chronological order and causal connections. Although the episodes of the overall narrative structure are presented more or less as they happen, due to the viewpoint of the hero-narrator Hysminias, the text displays a number of retrospects and a number of doublings and repetitions with variation.<sup>18</sup> The terminology that we need here concerns the internal reference system that enables backward- and forward-moving in a text. Anticipation, or *prolepsis*, prepares the reader for what will come, whereas recapitulation, or *analepsis*, reminds him of what has happened. These are, however, not the only functions of recapitulation and anticipation; they are also means of inserting such retardations as ekphraseis and other digressions into the plot, to create a bridge and thus return to the course of events.

### OPENING OF THE NOVEL

*H&H* opens with a short description of the city of the hero-narrator, Eurykomis:

Πόλις Εὐρύκωμις καὶ τὰλλα μὲν ἀγαθή, ὅτι καὶ θαλάσση στεφανοῦται καὶ ποταμοῖς καταρρεῖται καὶ λειμῶσι κωμᾶ καὶ τρυφαῖς εὐθηνεῖται παντοδαπαῖς, τὰ δ' εἰς θεοὺς εὐσεβής, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰς χρυσᾶς Ἀθήνας ὅλη βωμός, ὅλη θῦμα θεοῖς καὶ ἀνάθημα. Προκηρύσσει τὰς ἑορτάς, πανηγύρεις ἄγει, θύει τὰ πρόσφορα καὶ Διὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς. 2 Παρὰ δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ Εὐρυκώμιδι καιρὸς Διασίωιν καὶ κλήρος ἐπὶ τοὺς κήρυκας· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος τῇ πόλει καὶ νόμος ἄγραφος· ἂν καιρὸς πανηγύρεως ἱερᾶς, κλήρος ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄζυγας τῶν προυχόντων τῆς πόλεως· καὶ πρὸς ὃν ὁ κλήρος ἐκπέσοι, κήρυξ στέλλεται τῇ λαχούσῃ, πρότερον ἐστεφανωμένος τῆς δάφνης.

2 Κλήρος οὖν ἐπ' ἐμὲ καὶ στεφανίτης ἐγώ, κάλλιστέ μοι Χαρίδουξ, καὶ κήρυξ ἱερὸς ἐς Αὐλίκωμιν. (*H&H* 1.1.1–1.2.1)

The city of Eurykomis is excellent, not only because it is garlanded by the sea and watered by the rivers and luxuriates in meadows and flourishes with all kinds of delicacies, but also because it is pious to the gods, being even more than the golden Athens an altar, a sacrifice and an offering to the gods. It proclaims celebra-

<sup>18</sup> On these terms, see above, p. 50, nn. 15–16.

tions, it holds festivals, it sacrifices offerings to Zeus and the other gods. 2 In this Eurykomis the time of the Diasia is also the time when lots are cast for the heralds; for it is both the city's custom and also an unwritten law that, whenever it is the time for the sacred festival, lots should be cast among the unmarried men in the prominent families in the city; and the man on whom the lot falls is sent as herald to the city allotted to him, having first been garlanded with laurel.

2 Thus the lot fell on me, and I was garlanded, my dear Charidoux, and became the sacred herald to Aulikomis.

The city of Eurykomis is not the central setting of the story, for it is in Aulikomis that the protagonists meet and fall in love and thus trigger the action on both internal and external levels. The description of Eurykomis functions (a) as a starting-point for the story of Hysminias, and (b) as a very short introduction of the hero himself; the reader may presume that he is a young, unmarried man of a prominent family.

As soon as the reader has been informed of the hero's name and mission, Hysminias travels to Aulikomis, where he is soon to arrive at Sosthenes' garden. This is the place where the couple meet, and where Eros appears and makes them fall in love—one might say, the "true" setting of the novel. It is also here that the first part, more than one third, of the novel takes place.<sup>19</sup> After spending three days in Aulikomis, Hysminias returns home, along with Hysmine and her parents, to spend three days in Eurykomis. After more journeys and adventures, the young lovers are reunited after about one year, and finally get permission to marry. The wedding is celebrated in Aulikomis, in the garden of Sosthenes. The protagonists never return to Eurykomis. The opening description thus functions as a sort of prologue of informational character.

There is nothing strange about a novel opening with a description of a city; this is how Tatius' novel opens, and also that of Longus.<sup>20</sup> What we should note here, however, is the way in which the first-person narrator and an addressee are introduced. The description of Eurykomis gives the impression of a third-person narration (*H&H* 1.1.1), when suddenly the first-person narrator appears (1.2.1). In the same sentence the narrator, "I, Hysminias", addresses a certain Charidoux, a fictional reader or listener. The presence of an addressee recalls epistolary or philosophical forms.<sup>21</sup> If we

<sup>19</sup> On the division of the novel into two or three parts, and on the problems related to such a division, see below, pp. 92–93.

<sup>20</sup> See below, pp. 178–180. On different kinds of openings in literature, see Nuttall (1992), who moves from the *Aenid* (pp. 1–32) to *David Copperfield* (pp. 171–200).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Agapitos (1991) 132, who describes the opening of *H&H* as an "epistolary, rather than narrative frame"; see also id. (1998b) 145.



look, for example, at the ethical essays of Plutarch, the pupil or student addressee is very common.<sup>22</sup> Also, an initial epistolary form may be used as a method of introducing a longer lecture or narrative.<sup>23</sup> The opening sequence of *H&H* displays a mixture of two generic influences: that of the ancient novel and that of the philosophical essay in the manner of Plutarch, who was well known and popular in Byzantium.<sup>24</sup> The philosophical tone that is achieved in this manner is, as we will see, maintained throughout the novel by means of both compositional and literary devices.<sup>25</sup>

#### ADVANCING THE PLOT

If we study the opening of the novel as the point of departure for the plot, we find that the element of chance and coincidence is strong.

Hysminias is appointed herald of the Diasia by lot and sent to Aulikomis. The opening description of the city of Eurykomis is important only in this respect: the city's tradition, "the unwritten law", to cast lots for the election of heralds. Once Hysminias has arrived at Aulikomis, it is not a matter of course that he will stay with the family of Hysmine, but So-sthenes "was the victor" in the competition to host the herald (*H&H* 1.3.3; cf. also the repetition of this event in 9.3.1). Thus the coming meeting of the young couple depends on two coincidences. A third coincidence is the "homonymity" of the hero and heroine. It is pointed out by Hysmine at their first meeting (1.9.1), and thereafter mentioned another five times.<sup>26</sup> The sacrifice of Hysmine to Poseidon is another event caused by the casting of lots (7.12.3). The enslavement of Hysminias is described as the result of lots and an oracle from Apollo,

καὶ χρησμός με καὶ κλῆρος πάλιν δουλογραφεῖ· καὶ πάλιν δοῦλος καὶ τρίδουλος ἐγώ, καὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν μετέλκομαι, ὥς χρησμός καὶ κλῆρος τὴν ἐμὴν ἐχαρίσατο δούλωσιν. (*H&H* 8.11.1)

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Plutarch, *Moralia* 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 17, 23, 25–26, 31, 40–41, 46, 51–52. The order of books is that of Xylander from 1570, which modern editions most often follow; for a list of the works in the *Moralia* in the traditional order, see Russell (1972) 164–172.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. Plutarch, *Moralia* 6, 30, 42. The dialogue form is often used in a similar way, i.e. to introduce a longer lecture or narration; see e.g. *Moralia* 11 and 47.

<sup>24</sup> Indeed influential enough to earn a notice in *ODB* 3: 1687–1688, with the complementary note of Baldwin (1995).

<sup>25</sup> See below, esp. pp. 181–186.

<sup>26</sup> *H&H* 1.14.1; 2.12.2; 2.13.2; 2.14.2, 2.14.3. On the names of the protagonists, see below, pp. 156–159.



and the oracle and the lot once again made me a slave, and once again I was a slave in triple servitude and taken off to the master's house on which the oracle and the lot had bestowed my servitude.

It may be noted that Tyche is rarely mentioned as the force behind these machinations and that they are presented as a seemingly "natural" course of events. She is mentioned in a few passages towards the end of the novel, twice by Hysminias himself, and once by his new master (*H&H* 8.21.3). Hysminias' comments on Tyche show that she is indeed the force behind his adventures, even if it has not been emphasised earlier in the novel. He describes himself as "the exemplification of Fate, a ghost from the underworld, the plaything of the gods, the Erinnyes' banquet."<sup>27</sup> He also blames his enslavement on Tyche: "through Fate I was the herald's slave."<sup>28</sup> In the last passage, Tyche is presented as the force behind both the drawing of lots and Apollo's oracles. It is the same god, Apollo, who later delivers the oracle that the couple should be set free (10.13.3). Tyche, without being frequently mentioned, does rule the world in which Hysmine and Hysminias live, just as she did in the ancient novel.<sup>29</sup>

Tyche plays an important role in the ancient novel, often seen as connected with the passivity of the hero and heroine; the helpless protagonists are thrown about in a world ruled by the cruel goddess.<sup>30</sup> It has been argued by Beaton that the same theme was "considerably extended" in the twelfth-century novels, and that the novelists took pains to create a world in which the initiative did not lie with the individual.<sup>31</sup> The phenomenon is seen as related to the novel's reappearance, which by Beaton is considered a consequence of intellectual anxiety.<sup>32</sup> Although I agree that Tyche is an important force in *H&H*,<sup>33</sup> I object to the connection made with the passive hero, and also to the connection made with the revival of the novel.<sup>34</sup> Firstly, the criticism of the novel's protagonists as passive is most often anachronistic and out-of-date. It deals with character construction not from an ancient or Byzantine, but from a modern point of view. A discussion of the issue eas-

<sup>27</sup> *H&H* 8.11.2: παράδειγμα Τύχης ἐγώ, νερτέρων σκιά, δαιμόνων παίγνιον, Ἑρινυῶν τράπεζα.

<sup>28</sup> *H&H* 9.7.1: δοῦλος ἐκ τύχης τοῦ κήρυκος.

<sup>29</sup> Pace Smith (1980), who argues that Tyche plays no part in *H&H*, but has been replaced by Eros. Cf. also Harder (2000) 68.

<sup>30</sup> See e.g. Billault (1991) 97–98, 107–109.

<sup>31</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 62.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. On Beaton's view of the revival of the novel, see above, p. 32.

<sup>33</sup> Not as important, though, as seen by Beaton, *ibid.* 63, with reference to Hunger (1980) 18–19.

<sup>34</sup> See Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 61–65, and cf. Macrides & Magdalino (1991) 151, n. 178.

ily turns first humorous and then patronising.<sup>35</sup> Secondly, the power of Tyche in *H&H* does not necessarily have to be seen in relation to the existing or non-existing intellectual anxiety of the twelfth century. There were indeed discussions of Tyche, both in the twelfth and other centuries,<sup>36</sup> but it may be dangerous to assume an intellectual and emotional movement on the basis of literary interests and tendencies. Instead, I would like to emphasise the literary challenge that Tyche constitutes: the opportunity to depict an exciting plot and grand feelings.<sup>37</sup> We have already seen how, in *H&H*, Tyche has been used in an elaborate manner in the construction of the plot (the series of coincidences that leads to the couple's meeting, relationship and reunion), and how the goddess is recalled at emotional moments to underline the tragic pathos of Hysminias' experiences (e.g. *H&H* 8.11.2).

When the first meeting has taken place another element is introduced to advance the story: the paintings in the garden of Sosthenes (*H&H* 2.2–9; 4.5–16). The first painting depicts the four Cardinal Virtues, and then Eros seated on a throne surrounded by a crowd of people, Night and Day, birds and fishes. The second is a representation of the twelve months.<sup>38</sup> The paintings, along with his discussions with his friend Kratisthenes, teach Hysminias about love and help awaken his feelings for Hysmine; they function as somewhat enigmatic anticipations of the coming action, and they represent the novel's main themes: love and art. An interesting aspect of the paintings on the compositional level is that they advance, but at the same time delay, the development of the plot. They are thus an important element in the slow process of falling in love that *H&H* displays, and they also contribute to the spatial character of the novel.<sup>39</sup>

The first painting, that of Eros, provokes yet another important element: the dreams of Hysminias (*H&H* 3.1; 3.4.2–3.7; 5.1–5.4.1; 6.18; 7.18–19). The dreams have a double function, since they both mirror the sexual awakening of Hysminias and forebode the coming sexual and marital union. As is the case with the paintings, the dreams both advance and delay the development of the story.

It is not until the return to Eurykomis that the external action of the novel is triggered: when Hysmine's parents want to marry off their daughter with another suitable young man the couple decide to elope. This decision

<sup>35</sup> For a discussion on the anti-hero concept, see below, pp. 249–250, 256.

<sup>36</sup> See Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 180–182, and Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39 and n. 79.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39.

<sup>38</sup> On the construction of these ekphraseis, see below, pp. 85–86.

<sup>39</sup> On the concept of spatiality, see above, pp. 40–43, and below, pp. 141–142.



leads to the separation that will last for about one year; for about one and a half books (*H&H* 7.16–9.5) the reader is held in suspense as regards the fortunes of Hysmine.

#### THE DOUBLING OF THE PLOT

A peculiarity of the plot, which is also a peculiarity of the composition, is the repetition of the first part of the story in the second part of the novel, i.e. a doubling of the story.<sup>40</sup> In book 8 Hysminias is taken prisoner and sold as a slave in the city of Daphnepolis. In Daphnepolis a feast to Apollo is celebrated at about the same time as the Diasia was celebrated in Hysminias' hometown Eurykomis. Hysminias' master is sent as a herald to Artykomis, and Hysminias accompanies him. They are there entertained by a host named Sostratos, who has a young daughter, whose slave girl turns out to be Hysmine. The parallels are striking: the cities Daphnepolis and Artykomis have the same kind of relation as had Eurykomis and Aulikomis; Hysminias was once a herald himself; his host was called Sosthenes; Sosthenes had a young daughter, Hysmine etc. I will describe the two "versions" in closer detail in order to bring forward both the similarities and the differences.

*H&H* 1.1.2–1.2 = 8.18–21. In book 1, the tradition of celebrating the Diasia in Eurykomis, the lot that fell on Hysminias and the procession that sees him off to Aulikomis are described in a few paragraphs; the emphasis lies on his brilliant escort:

Πρόειμι τοῦ ἱεροῦ περιεστεμμένος δαφνύνῳ στεφάνῳ, ἱερῷ χιτῶνι, ἀρβύλῃ σεμνῇ· δέχεται με τὸ παρεστῶς προπομπῇ ποικίλῃ λαμπάδων, κυμβάλων, δᾶδων, προπεμπτηρίων ῥόδων, ὅλης ἱερᾶς προπομπῆς. 2 Ὁρθῇ γοῦν ἡ πόλις, καὶ πᾶν τὸ ταύτης περὶ ἐμέ· ὁ μὲν ἀσπάζεται, ὁ δὲ περιπτύσσεται, ἄλλος ὀρχεῖται μου πρὸ ποδῶν, καὶ κατ' ἄλλος ἄλλον τὸν θρίαμβον ἐξυφαίνει μοι· εἵποις ἰδὼν ποταμὸν ἐροβρύχην καὶ πολύρρουν περιρρεῖν με τὸν κήρυκα. (*H&H* 1.2.1–2)

I came out of the temple, my head garlanded with a laurel wreath, wearing the sacred chiton and august sandal, and the bystanders welcomed me with a glittering escort of torches, cymbals, flares, processional songs, the entire sacred parade. 2 The city was in a hubbub and all people there surrounded me; one man saluted me, another embraced me, yet another danced before my feet and one here, another there contrived a triumph for me; if you had been watching you would have said that a raging flood of river-water was pouring around me, the herald.

<sup>40</sup> Pointed out, but not described in any detail, by Alexiou (1977) 30; Meunier (1991) 16; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 81–84, 212–214 and (2000) 186.



In book 8, the tradition of Daphnepolis and the feast of Apollo are described at greater length and in more detail, and the herald, Hysminias' master, returns to his house for dinner after the procession. The herald is here appointed by an oracle and not by lot, but the processions are similar, as is noted by Hysminias:

Καὶ πλῆθος περὶ τὸν κήρυκα, καὶ προπομπή λαμπρὰ καὶ ποικίλη, καὶ τὰλλ' ὅποσα καμὲ κατέπαιζε τὸ κηρύκειον· ὦν πάντων μεμνημένος ἐγὼ μέσῳ λαμπρῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ λαμπρᾷ τελετῇ πλήρει χαρίτων καὶ ἡδονῆς θρήνων ἐπληρούμην καὶ κωκυτῶν, καὶ ὡς ἐν κεραυνῷ τῇ μνήμῃ τὴν ψυχὴν ὅλην κατεκεραυνοβολούμην πυκνά. (*H&H* 8.19.2)

There was a crowd around the herald and a brilliant procession and all the other fun stuff that the office of herald had brought to me. I recalled all this in the midst of the brilliant theatre and the brilliant rite that was full of grace and pleasure, and I was overwhelmed with lamentation and grief and my whole soul was riveted by the memory as if transfixed by a thunderbolt.

The master herald is also equipped with the same insignia as was Hysminias: a laurel wreath, a tunic, and sandals (8.19.3).<sup>41</sup> After the dinner in Daphnepolis comes a second procession, again reminiscent of the first one in Eurykomis: καὶ πάλιν ἡ πόλις ὀρθή, καὶ πάλιν λαμπρὰ προπομπή, καὶ πάλιν πανήγυρις, καὶ πάλιν ὦδαί, καὶ τὰλλ' ὅποσα κοσμοῦσι τοὺς κήρυκας, “once again the city was astir and once again there was a brilliant procession and once again a celebration and chanting and everything that brings honour to heralds” (8.21.4). The repetition of similar events, or aspects of events, entails a certain repetition of words, which may seem unimaginative.<sup>42</sup> In the light of repetition with variation as a narrative strategy it should, however, be seen as a stylistic and rhetorical effect, and not as a failing on the part of the author.<sup>43</sup>

*H&H* 1.3 = 9.1–9.3.1. Hysminias' arrival at Aulikomis and the “victory” of Sosthenes in book 1 is mirrored in book 9 by the master's arrival at Artykomis and the “victory” of Sostratos. Again, the first version is comparatively short and condensed, and the people's tribute to Hysminias is

<sup>41</sup> Two different words are used for the heralds' footwear: ἀρβύλη in *H&H* 1.2.1; 8.13.1; 10.15.1, and in all other cases πέδιλον. Since the author refers to the same footwear both as ἀρβύλη and as πέδιλον, both are probably used in the same sense; both are therefore translated here as “sandal”.

<sup>42</sup> Hilberg (1876) points out in his introduction, p. xxii, n. 2, that ὅλος is used 399 times. Other frequent words are λαμπρός and, quite naturally, πάλιν. On λαμπρός and its common use especially in *H&H* 8.13–9.1, see Plepelits (1989) 74, who discusses stylistic features in pp. 73–76. On lexical repetition, see Poljakova (1979) 108–110.

<sup>43</sup> On the rhetorical character of *H&H*, see also below, pp. 73–74 and n. 70.

emphasised (1.3.1–2); the details of the procession are repeated in the second version (9.1–9.2.1). It is interesting to note how the “victory” scene has been slightly, but significantly, changed:

ἐφέλκονται με πάντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς, ἐτυχίαν ἡγούμενοι πρὸς ὃν καταλύσαιμι, ὥς ὑπὲρ μεγάλων ἐκ μεγάλης στελλόμενον κήρυκα. 3 Νικᾷ Σωσθένης, καὶ ἄρμα φέρων ἀνάγει μοι καὶ ἄγει με περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ φιλοφρονεῖται με μάλα φιλοτίμως καὶ εἰσάγει με περὶ τὸν κήπον. (H&H 1.3.2–3)

Everyone tried to carry me off for themselves, thinking that I would bring good fortune to my host, since I had been sent as herald on great matters from a great city. 3 Sosthenes was the victor and, bringing up his chariot, led me off and brought me to his house and took most generous care of me and showed me round his garden.

Οἱ τῆς Ἀρτυκώμιδος προύχοντες ζητοῦσι ξενίσαι τὸν κήρυκα, καὶ ὅλον ἕκαστος πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀνθέλκεται καὶ μεθέλκεται, καὶ καινὴ τις ἔρις καὶ φιλοξενίας ἀγών· εἴποι τις ἰδὼν

ἀγαθὴ δ' ἔρις βροτοῖσι.

3 Σώστρατος νικᾷ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ ἄρμα φέρων ἀνάγει καὶ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν μετὰγει τὸν κήρυκα καὶ φιλοφρονεῖται τοῦτον φιλοτιμώτατα, ὅσα καὶ Σωσθένης Ὑσμινίαν ἐμὲ πλὴν Ὑσμίνης πολυτελῶς ἐφιλοφρονήσατο· ἃ πάντα μέσης ἤπτετό μου ψυχῆς, καὶ λήθης νυχόμην κρατῆρα πιεῖν. (H&H 9.2.3–9.3.1)

The leading citizens of Artykomis sought to have the herald as their guest and each pulled and thrust to have him entirely for themselves, and there was a fresh contest and a struggle over hospitality; one might say that *a contest is good for mortals*.<sup>44</sup>

3 Sostratos won the struggle and, bringing up his chariot, led the herald off and brought him to his house and cared for him most honourably, as Sosthenes cared for me, Hysminias, most extravagantly, except for the matter of Hysmine. All this struck deep in my soul and I prayed to drink the cup of forgetfulness.

As we can see, the second version is longer and more detailed. The fullness of detail is brought about by Hysminias' now external perspective: he sees what he once experienced and puts it in relation to his own life as he remembers. The events are described in the same or similar words (ἐφέλκονται, ἀνθέλκεται, μεθέλκεται; ἀγει, ἀνάγει, μετὰγει; φιλοφρονεῖται, φιλοτίμως, φιλοτιμώτατα). In passages like these we must also note the similar names Sosthenes and Sostratos: in the second part of the novel, Sosthenes has been replaced by Sostratos. The similarity of the names in the confusingly similar versions of the story causes a comic or ironic effect.

<sup>44</sup> Hesiod, *Erga* 24. I owe the identification of quotations of and allusion to ancient literature in H&H to, primarily, Gigante (1960); most of the ancient sources are also noted in Conca (1994a). On quotation, allusion, and *Quellenforschung*, see further below, part 3.



*H&H* 1.8–11 = 9.3.2–9.4. The dinner in book 1 is described in detail, with particular care devoted to Hysmine and her actions: how she mixes and pours the wine, how she flirts with Hysminias. At the corresponding dinner at Sostratos' house in book 9, Rhodope has taken Hysmine's place as a wine pourer. The passage contains explicit comparison of the two maidens: Rhodope is *καλὴ μὲν κατὰ παρθένον ἀπλῶς, πρὸς δέ γε τὴν ἐμὴν ἐκείνην Ὑσμίνην ὥς πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην μιμῶ*, "a lovely girl if you compare her with the general run of maidens, but in comparison with my Hysmine, she was like an ape compared to Aphrodite" (9.3.2), and it is twice pointed out that Hysmine was the one who poured the wine in Aulikomis (9.4.2, 9.4.3). In 9.4.1, there is a twitch in Hysminias' right eye, a good omen that predicts the presence of Hysmine.<sup>45</sup> The omen and the frequent mentioning of Hysmine hint at the girl's presence, a presence that is similarly represented through the parallels to the very first dinner in Aulikomis.

*H&H* 1.12 = 9.5. The footwashing that Hysmine performs in book 1 is repeated in book 9, now by Rhodope. The procedure is the same: after dinner, the daughter of the family, followed by three servant girls, washes the feet of the herald. The manner is different: Hysmine took the opportunity to play with Hysminias' feet, pressing, tickling and even kissing them.<sup>46</sup> Rhodope does no such thing, but her performance still reminds Hysminias, and apparently one of the servant girls, of that first episode:

ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ περὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀναλογισάμενος πόδας ἔκ τε χειρῶν καὶ χειλέων τῆς ἐμῆς ἐκείνης Ὑσμίνης χαριεντίσματα πνεῦμά τι μέγα καὶ λίαν ὀδυνηρὸν ἐξ ἐμῶν μέσων ἐγκάτων ἀνέσπασα καὶ δακρύων ἐπληρώθην τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς· 3 καὶ θεραπαίνις ἡ τῶν ποδῶν τὸ μάκτρον ἀνέχουσα πρὸ χειρῶν μικρὸν ὑπεστέναξεν, ὥσπερ μιμουμένη τὸ τῆς ἡχοῦς ὑστερόφωνον, καὶ οἶον Ὑσμίνην λεπτὸν ὑπεστέναξεν, ὅτε τῷ ποδί μου τὸν πόδα ταύτης ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Σωσθέ- νους τραπέζης ἐπέθλιψα. (*H&H* 9.5.2–3)

I, recollecting the caresses given my feet by my Hysmine's hands and lips, gave vent to a great and grievous sigh from the depths of my entrails, and my eyes filled with tears. 3 And the servant girl who was holding the towel for the feet in her hands moaned gently, as though imitating the echoes of my sigh, and sighed delicately as Hysmine had done when I pressed her foot with mine at Sosthenes' table.

The scene's similarities with the episode in book 1, Hysminias' explicit recollections, and also the behaviour of the "servant girl", juxtapose the two corresponding passages and prepare for the soon-to-follow recognition of Hysmine.

<sup>45</sup> On this allusion to Theocritus, see below, p. 266.

<sup>46</sup> On this passage and the different interpretations of it, see further below, pp. 280–281.



*H&H* 2.12–2.13 = 9.7.2–9.11.1 and 3.10–4.2 = 9.16. All in all there are eighteen dinners, or banquets, in the novel, while not all are described in detail.<sup>47</sup> There are three dinners at each private house in each of the four cities: Aulikomis in 1.7–11, 2.12–13, 3.10–4.2; Eurykomis in 5.9.3–5.12, 6.1.2–6.4, 6.15; Daphnepolis in 8.12–8.15.1, 8.20–21, 10.7–8; Artykomis in 9.3.2–4, 9.7.2–9.11.1, 9.16–9.21.1. There are also two dinners among the barbarians (8.4 and 8.8.2–3), and two dinners at the priest's house in Daphnepolis (10.16–10.18.1 and 11.2–11.17.1). Finally the couple's wedding is celebrated with a banquet in the garden of Sosthenes in Aulikomis (11.18.2–11.19). One dinner also occurs in a dream (3.5).

We have seen how the first dinner in Aulikomis corresponds to the first dinner in Artykomis, and the same may be said of the second and third banquets in the two cities. At the second dinner in Aulikomis (2.12–13), Hysmine continues to flirt with Hysminias, who does not give in at dinner, but afterwards relives the banquet in a dream in which he returns all her advances (3.5). At the dinner in Artykomis, Hysmine reveals herself in a letter (9.9), which means that the couple are now formally reunited—as they were informally united in Hysminias' dream in 3.5. The third dinner in Aulikomis (3.10–4.2) is filled with flirtation corresponding to Rhodope's kisses transmitted to Hysminias by Hysmine in 9.16.

There are also other corresponding dinner sequences. For example, the first dinner in Eurykomis (5.9.3–5.12) has an analogue in book 10, the arrival dinner in Daphnepolis (10.7–8). The flirting of the first version is reflected and augmented in the second, as three women now are coming on to Hysminias.

*H&H* 4.3 = 9.21–10.4.1. The protagonists' meeting in the garden in the beginning of 4.3 is first repeated in 4.21–23. The episode then appears in a second version in the garden in Artykomis in book 9. Both episodes are immediately followed by dreams (5.1–5.4.1 and 10.4.2–3), which occur on the last night in Aulikomis and Artykomis respectively.

*H&H* 5.6–5.7 = 10.5. Hysminias' departure from Aulikomis is mirrored in his master's departure from Artykomis in book 10.

Ἦκεν ὁ Σωσθένης καὶ περὶ τὴν πύλην τοῦ δωματίου γενόμενος Ὑσμινία κήρυξ' φησὶν ἰδοῦ σοι πᾶσα Αὐλίκωμις πρὸ πυλῶν· πάντες ζητοῦσι τὸν κήρυκα· τὴν κεφαλὴν στεφανώθητι, τῷ χιτῶνι καὶ τῷ πεδίλῳ κατακοσμήθητι,

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Poljakova (1979) 107, who counts 12 dinners, and Burton (1998) 208, who mentions the 14 "symposia" of the novel. On the dinner motif, which will not be discussed in any detail here, see below, p. 227, n. 282.

ὅλον περιδύθῃ τὸ κηρύκειον, ἵνα σε καὶ Ποσειδῶν αἰδεσθῇ καὶ πνεῦμα θύσῃ Διὶ μετάγον εἰς Ἑυρυκώμιδα.' [...]

7 Ἦκω περὶ τὴν πύλῃν τοῦ κήπου καὶ πᾶσαν ὁρῶ τὴν Αὐλίκωμιν ποικίλῃν μοι τὴν προπομπὴν ἐξυφαίνουσιν ῥοδαῖς, κυμβάλοις, λαμπάσι, παστάσι, ῥόδοις, ἄνθεσιν, ὕμνοις, ἀλαλαγμοῖς καὶ πᾶσιν ἄλλοις ὅσα μὴ κήρυξιν ἀλλὰ θεοῖς ἀφωσίωται. 2 Καὶ ἵνα μὴ δοκῶ σοι δοξομανεῖν κατὰ μέρος καταρρητορεύων τῷ λόγῳ τὴν προπομπήν, οὕτω τὴν καλὴν ἐξήλθον Αὐλίκωμιν, τὴν τῆς Ὑσμίνης πατρίδα, τὴν καλλιγύναικα, ὥς Ὀλυμπιονίκης καὶ νικήσας τὸ πένταθλον, καί, ἵνα τὰν μέσῳ παρῶ, περὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἦκον Εὐρύκωμιν. (H&H 5.6–7)

Sosthenes came up and, standing by the door to the chamber, said, 'Hysminias the herald, see, the entire city of Aulikomis is before your door. Everyone is looking for you, the herald. Put the garland on your head, put on your tunic and your sandals, assume your herald's costume so that Poseidon may honour you and offer to Zeus a wind that will convey you to Eurykomis.' [...]

7 I came to the gate of the garden and saw all Aulikomis preparing a brilliant escorting procession for me with songs, drums, torches, flares, roses, flowers, hymns, ululations and everything else that is dedicated to gods, though not to heralds.<sup>48</sup> 2 And so that I do not seem to you to be glory-mongering in my detailed account of my procession, I departed from the lovely Artykomis, fair in women, Hysmine's homeland, like an Olympic victor who had been victorious in the pentathlon, and—to pass over what happened next—I came to my own city of Eurykomis.

Ἐφίσταται Σώστρατος καὶ φησιν ἰδοῦ σοι, κήρυξ, πᾶσα πόλις Ἀρτύκωμιν πρὸ πυλῶν συνεκπλεῦσαι ζητοῦσά σοι πρὸς Δαφνήπολιν· σὺ δέ μοι περιδύθῃ τὸ κηρύκειον καὶ ὅλος κήρυξ γενεῖ. Στεφανοῦται τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁ κήρυξ, τῷ χιτῶνι καὶ τῷ πεδίλῳ κατακοσμεῖται, καὶ ὅλον περιθέμενος τὸ κηρύκειον ἕξεισι τοῦ δωματίου. 2 Καὶ πάλιν ἡ πόλις ὀρθή, καὶ πάλιν ὀρχεῖται τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὸν προπεμπτήριον λαμπρὸν ὑφαίνει τῷ κήρυκι, οἶον καὶ τὸν εἰσιτήριον πολυτελεῖ προεξύφαινε· καὶ ἵνα τὰν μέσῳ παρῶ, τῆς νεὺς ἐπιβάντες ἐκείθεν ἀπέβημεν καὶ περὶ τὴν Δαφνήπολιν ἐγενόμεθα. (H&H 10.5)

Sostratos arrived and said, 'Look, herald, the whole city of Artykomis is at the door asking to sail with you to Daphnepolis. Put on your herald's garb and take up your herald's role.' The herald garlanded his head, arrayed himself in his tunic and sandals and in the herald's full panoply left the chamber. 2 Once again the city was in a hubbub and once again the crowd was dancing and had prepared a magnificent escort for the herald, as glorious as the welcome that had been offered earlier. To pass over what happened next, going on board ship, we left there and arrived at Daphnepolis.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Hysminias' arrival to Aulikomis, where he is received not as a herald but as a god, in H&H 1.3.1.



Words and formulas are repeated,<sup>49</sup> most remarkably the elliptical formula that closes the passage: “to pass over what happened next ...”. The descriptions of the processions are similarly reflections of the arrival scenes, of which the first was Hysminias’ arrival in Artykomis (1.3). Again, we may also note the appearance in similar positions of the names Sosthenes and Sostratos.<sup>50</sup>

*H&H* 5.8 = 10.6. Arriving in their hometowns, the heralds go to the altars of Zeus and Apollo respectively.

Οὕτω τοίνυν, οὕτω λαμπρῶς, οὕτω φιλοτίμως, οὕτω βασιλικῶς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἦκω βωμὸν Ξενίου Διός, καί μοι συνείπετο πᾶν τὸ συνεκπλεύσαν ἐξ Αὐλικῶμιδος. (*H&H* 5.8.2)

So I came with such splendour, such honour, such imperial pomp to the altar of Zeus god of strangers and the entire group that had sailed with me from Aulikomis accompanied me.

‘Ο μὲν οὖν δὴ κήρυξ καὶ δεσπότης ἐμὸς σὺν τοῖς ἐξ Ἀρτυκῶμιδος συνεκπλεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Δαφνίου βωμὸν κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῖς κήρυξι γέγονεν· ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν ὅσοι τῷ κήρυκι συνεξεπλεύσαμεν εἰς Ἀρτύκωμιν περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ δεσπότητος γεγόναμεν’ (*H&H* 10.6.1)

The herald, my master, together with those who had sailed from Artykomis, made for the altar of him who wears the laurel, as is customary for heralds. I, with those of us who had sailed with the herald to Artykomis, went to my master’s house.

The now subordinate position of Hysminias is underlined in the second version as he, together with Hysmine, goes to the house, where he is attacked by his lovesick mistress.

*H&H* 5.15–5.20 = 10.9.3–10.15. When Hysminias has returned to Eurykomis, his and Hysmine’s parents go to the altar of Zeus to make sacrifices, first in 5.15.1, then repeated in 6.5.2 and 7.1.1.<sup>51</sup> The time formula used in book 5 is repeated in book 10, when the same procedure takes place in Daphnepolis:

Περὶ δὲ τρίτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς Σώστρατος σὺν Ῥοδόπῃ καὶ δεσπότηται ἐμοῖς περὶ τὸν βωμὸν διανυκτερεύουσιν, Ὑσμίνη δὲ καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσπότηται κατὰ

<sup>49</sup> *H&H* 5.6.1 (ἰδοὺ σοι πᾶσα Αὐλικῶμις πρὸ πυλῶν) = 10.5.1 (ἰδοὺ σοι, κήρυξ, πᾶσα πόλις Ἀρτύκωμις πρὸ πυλῶν); 5.6.1 (τὴν κεφαλὴν στεφανώθητι, τῷ χιτῶνι καὶ τῷ πεδίλῳ κατακοσμήθητι, ὅλον περιδύθητι τὸ κηρύκειον) = 10.5.1 (σὺν δέ μοι περιδύθητι τὸ κηρύκειον καὶ ὅλος κήρυξ γενοῦ κτλ); 5.7.1 (ποικίλῃ μοι τὴν προπομπὴν ἐξυφαίνουσιν) = 10.5.2 (τὸν προπεμπτήριον λαμπρὸν ὑφαίνει τῷ κήρυκι).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, p. 58.

<sup>51</sup> *H&H* 5.15.1: περὶ δὲ τρίτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς; 6.5.2: πάλιν οὖν ὁ συνήθησιν τῶν θυμάτων καιρὸς; 7.1.1: ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ θυμάτων καιρὸς, καὶ πάλιν κτλ.

δούλους ἐπόμενοι σὺν αὐτοῖς δεσπόταις περὶ τὸν βωμὸν καὶ τρίποδα καὶ δάφνην γεγόναμεν. (*H&H* 10.9.3)

About the third watch of the night Sostratos, with Rhodope and my masters, went to keep vigil at the altar while Hysmine and I followed our masters in our roles as slaves and came with them to the altar and the tripod and the laurel tree.

Again, the similarity in the shaping of the episodes underlines the subordination of the protagonists. The drama of the scene 6.10–11, when the sacrifice is snatched by an eagle and Panthia laments her daughter's fate, is partly reflected in the parents' laments and the final reunion in book 10.

Traditionally, repetition and recapitulation are used to remind the reader of previous events, or to emphasise particularly important points of a story. In *H&H* this is not their main function. For example, recapitulations often follow directly upon the event itself,<sup>52</sup> and the frequency is extreme: almost half of the novel consists of repeated material, story-wise or lexically.<sup>53</sup>

The story takes place again at another, but in a way the same, place: Daphnepolis has the same customs as Eurykomis, and Artykomis is an analogue to Aulikomis. The sequence of events in the two parts is almost the same: the same number of dinners, the same rituals and procedures.<sup>54</sup> There are, of course, also differences, primarily the now subordinate position of the hero and heroine: they are now slaves, not only to Eros, but to "real" masters. This state mirrors the enslavement to Eros in book 3.<sup>55</sup>

The ekphraseis, the detailed descriptions of Hysmine's flirtation, and the erotic dreams of the first part of the novel have been replaced in the second part by long dialogues and monologues, some detailed description and the sub-plots of Hysminias' mistress and Rhodope. The protagonists are forced to see themselves from a new (sub-) perspective, which is underlined by means of the mentioned sub-plots. As Hysmine tries to convince Hysminias (*H&H* 9.19, 9.22), they have to adjust to their subordination in order to pass the "trial" and be reunited; the period in slavery may be seen as a variation of the more traditional adventures and trials in the ancient novels. The doubling of the plot thus emphasises the ritualistic nature of the slavery episode.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Hysminias' retelling of events to Kratisthenes in *H&H* 1.14 and 2.14.2.

<sup>53</sup> Poljakova (1979) 106; Poljakova discusses repetitions of situations and lexical repetitions in pp. 106–110. See also Meunier (1991) 15–17.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 84, who argues that the second part runs in close parallel with the first, but with significant displacements in time, place, and action.

<sup>55</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 84.



## REPETITION WITH VARIATION

In addition to the doubling of the plot, the novel contains a large number of repetitions with variation. Passages are repeated in the same or in a slightly different manner, functioning as a kind of internal reference system—most often as recapitulations, but sometimes also as anticipations. In all, there are ten regular recapitulations: *H&H* 1.14.1–3; 2.14.2–3; 3.3.2; 5.5.1–2; 6.12; 8.10; 8.13; 8.16.2–3; 9.13; 11.3–10. They vary from brief, but most often detailed, summaries of events such as dinners to long recapitulations of the whole story. They are all retellings of events that the reader already knows of. That is not really the case with the story of what happened to Hysmine after she was thrown overboard at sea (11.13–16). It has, however, been hinted at in her letter to Hysminias:

*Ὑσμίνη παρθένος Ὑσμινία τῷ ἐραστῇ χαίρειν. Ὑσμινία Θεμιστείδη, ἴσθι ὡς Ὑσμίνην τὴν σὴν δελφὶν θαλάσσης ἐρύσσατο, καὶ πηγὴ καὶ τόξον Ἀρτέμιδος, παρθένου θεᾶς, παρθένου σοι ταύτην παρεφυλάξατο (H&H 9.9.1)*

The maiden Hysmine to her lover Hysminias, greetings. Hysminias son of Themisteus, know that a dolphin rescued your Hysmine from the sea, and that the spring and the bow of Artemis, the virgin goddess, have preserved her a virgin for you.

The letter is a kind of recapitulation—it deviates backwards from the time of narration—but at the same time it has a proleptic function,<sup>56</sup> hinting at the full story told by Hysmine in book 11:

*ἐπεὶ δ' ἐξεσφενδονήθη ἐν εἰς θάλασσαν, δελφὶν ἐπὶ νῶτόν με δέχεται, τοῖς κύμασιν κυβιστῶν καὶ ὅλος κούφως νηχόμενος [...]. Ἐπεὶ δ' ἦδη τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεψύσω τοῖς κύμασι, μεῖράκιον ἐφίσταται μοι γυμνόν (ἐπὶ δελφίνος ἐστὼς καὶ αὐτό) καὶ χεῖρά μοι προτείνει καὶ λαβὼν ἐπὶ τὴν χέρσον ἐξάγει με, καὶ πτερυζάμενον τοῖν ποδοῖν (ἦν γὰρ πτερωτὸν τῷ πόδε) ἀπέπτῃ μου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. (H&H 11.13.2–11.14.1)*

When I was cast into the sea, a dolphin took me on his back as it plunged through the waves and swam on lightly. [...] When I was at the point of breathing out my soul into the waves, a naked youth appeared before me (he was also standing on a dolphin); he stretched out his hand to me and, taking hold of me, brought me to dry land; then, fluttering his feet (for both feet were winged), he flew away from my sight.

Hysmine's rescue has also been anticipated in Hysminias' dream in book 7:

<sup>56</sup> On the function of the letter in the Komnenian novels, see Harder (1997b).

‘Ο δ’ ἐπτερύξατο τοῖν ποδοῖν καὶ κατὰ μέσα πελάγη γενόμενος ἐμπίπτει τοῖς κύμασι καὶ χωρεῖ πρὸς βυθὸν καὶ μετ’ οὐ πολὺ μοι πάλιν ἐφίσταται τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἀνέχων πρὸ τῶν χειρῶν [...]. (H&H 7.19)

He [sc. Eros] took wing with his feet and darting to the middle of the ocean plunged into the waves and sank down to the deep and not long after appeared before me again, holding Hysmine in his hands [...].

The reader, used to the conventions of the ancient novel, may suspect that this mirrors a real event, and that Hysmine is actually saved—whether by Eros or in some other way.<sup>57</sup> The passage also shows that Eros’ nakedness has a double function: it is not just a weapon aimed at the fish, as was explained by Kratisthenes (2.11.3), but also a means of opposing Poseidon. Even if Poseidon succeeded in forcing the captain to sacrifice Hysmine to the sea, Eros saved her. He did answer Hysminias’ prayer in book 7: ἡδη σοι καιρὸς καὶ τῇ γυμνώσει τοῦ σώματος χρήσασθαι καθ’ ὅλης Ἀμφιτρίτης καὶ Ποσειδῶνος αὐτοῦ, “now it is time for you to use the nakedness of your body against Amphitrite herself and Poseidon too” (7.17.7).

The *anagnorismos* of Hysmine is anticipated also in a few other passages in book 9, so that the recognition is gradually revealed. First, Hysminias’ right eye gives a start (H&H 9.4.1), a good omen which according to the ancient tradition is a sign that one will meet a good friend or a beloved.<sup>58</sup> Then he thinks he recognises Hysmine in one of the slave girls (9.5.3), which makes him lie sleepless and wonder:

‘ἀρ’ ἦν Ὑσμίνη;’ λέγων πρὸς ἑαυτόν· ‘ἀλλ’ ἐκ χειρῶν ἀπεσπάρσθη τούτων ἐμῶν, καὶ χερσὶ κυβερνήτου δημίου πρὸ τούτων ἐμῶν ἐλεεινῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐξεσφενδονήθη τοῖς κύμασιν. 3 Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς, ἀλλ’ Ἐρως τὴν κόρην ἐρρύσατο, καὶ πάντως ἔχει ταύτην Αὐλίκωμις· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ κακῷ καὶ δουλείᾳ ταύτην ἐσώσαντο.’ (H&H 9.6.2–3)

I said to myself, ‘Surely it was Hysmine? But she was torn from these hands of mine, and before these pitiable eyes of mine she was cast into the waves by the hands of the murderous helmsman. But Zeus, but Eros has rescued the girl and now certainly Aulikomis shelters her. They would not have saved her for misery and servitude.’

We may note how Hysminias hints at the truth without knowing it, and how he misinterprets Eros’ actions: the god has indeed saved Hysmine “for misery and servitude”. The next day he once again sees the girl and is re-

<sup>57</sup> But cf. in opposition to this, the reaction of Hysminias: τὰ δ’ ἦσαν πάντα καὶ πάλιν ὄνειροι δουλεύοντες Ἐρωτι, “all this, once again, was but a dream in the service of Eros” (H&H 7.19).

<sup>58</sup> On this allusion to Theocritus, see below, p. 266.



mind of Hysmine (9.8.1), and shortly afterwards he receives the letter from another slave girl with the words ἐξ Ὑσμίνης παρθένου σῆς ἐρωμένης καὶ νῦν ἐμῆς ὁμοδούλου τοῦτό σοι τὸ ἐπιστόλιον, “this letter is for you from the maiden Hysmine, your beloved and now my fellow slave” (9.8.4). There are thus three basic steps in the *anagnorismos*: the first sight of the girl who looks like Hysmine, the second sight of the same girl, and finally the letter that confirms the reader’s and Hysminias’ own suspicions.

There are no regular anticipations in the novel, but there are a few more passages that mirror and anticipate future events. The bad omen at the sacrifice in book 6, when an eagle swoops down from the sky and seizes the sacrifice (*H&H* 6.10), mirrors three events: the unsuitable marriage between Hysmine and the young man that her parents have found for her; the elopement of Hysmine and Hysminias; the sacrifice of Hysmine to Poseidon at sea. Another series of proleptic passages are those that concern the protagonists’ wedding. After Hysminias has seen the paintings of Eros in the garden he experiences a dream in which Hysmine “recruits him for Eros’ service”.<sup>59</sup> Hysminias is “given” to Hysmine by Eros himself with the words ἔχεις ἐραστήν, “you have your lover” (3.1.6). The passage obviously marks the awakened erotic feelings of Hysminias. The next night Hysminias dreams that he marries Hysmine:

Ἄλλος παστάδα κατέπηξε, νυμφοστολήσας αὐτήν λαμπρῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως νυμφαγωγήσας, καὶ στεφανώσας μοι τὴν Ὑσμίνην μεγαλοπρεπῶς συνεκάθισε καὶ τράπεζαν παρετίθετο καὶ τὸν ὑμέναιον ἦδε καὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας ἔπлатτε περὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ὀρχουμένους καὶ παίζοντας ὅσα παίζουνσιν ἔρωτες. (*H&H* 5.2)

Another dream set up a bridal chamber, preparing a brilliant bridal procession for the girl, escorting her honourably, and crowning Hysmine together with me magnificently; it sat us down together and laid out a table and sang the marriage song and conjured up Erotes dancing around the table and sporting in the way that Erotes do.

The dream may be seen as a kind of guarantee of the coming wedding, and as we will see, the vocabulary here anticipates the description of the actual event in 11.19. Another dream of Hysminias hints at the wedding and union in a less obvious way. It is worthwhile to quote the whole passage, including the description of Hysminias’ mood after Kratisthenes has promised to arrange the elopement:

17 Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κρατισθένης ἐξῆλθε τοῦ δωματίου, ἐγὼ δ’ ὅλος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην ἀνακλιθεὶς ὅλας εἶχον λογισμῶν θαλάσσας ἐπικλυζούσας μου τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ

<sup>59</sup> *H&H* 3.1.4: τοῦτον δουλογραφήσω. On the word δουλογραφέω, see below, p. 112, n. 238.

ὡς ναὺς ἐν σάλῳ κατεκυματούμην καὶ κλύδωνι· 2 ἡνιώμην, ἔχαιρον, ἐδειλίω, ἐθάρρουν, ὅλος ἤμην ἡδονῆς καὶ φόβου μεστός· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιτυχεῖν σφόδρα μου κατέσαινε τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸ δ' ἀποτυχεῖν καὶ λίαν κατέσειεν.

18 Ἐν μέσοις δὴ τούτοις τοῖς κύμασιν, ἐν ὅλαις θαλάσσαις καὶ κλύδωνι, ὕπνος μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς περικέχεται, καὶ πλήθος οὐκ εὖ ἀριθμούμενον ὀρώ περὶ τὸ δωμάτιον νεανίσκων καὶ παρθένων ἐστεφανωμένων ῥόδῳ τὰς κεφαλὰς, τὰς χεῖρας συνδουμένων ἀλλήλοις κατὰ σειρὰν καὶ μέλος ἀδόντων οἷον Σειρήνες ἄδουσι· καὶ ἦν τὸ μέλος Ἑρωτος ὕμνος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἐγκώμια· τὸ δ' ἄσμα καθ' ὑμέναιον ἦδετο καὶ οἷον ἐπὶ πασάσιν ἄδουσιν Ἑρῶτες. 2 Τὸ μὲν οὖν δὴ πλήθος ἦδε τὸ μέλος, καὶ μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἡδονῆς ἐπλήρου καὶ χάριτος ἐρωτικῆς, καὶ ἤμην ὅλος [ἔρως] ὡς ἐκβεβακχευμένος ἐξ ἔρωτος. 3 Ἐν μέσῳ τούτῳ τῷ συμμίκτῳ χορῷ τῷ λαμπρῷ τῷ χαρίεντι, ἐν μέσοις στεφάνοις, ἐν μέσαις ῥοδαῖς, ἐν μέσοις ἐρωτικοῖς μελωδήμασιν ὀρώ καὶ πάλιν ἐκείνου τὸν ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τοῦ δίφρου καθήμενον Ἑρῶτα βασιλικῶς ἐσταλμένου καὶ τὴν Ὑσμίνην τῆς χειρὸς μεθελκόμενον· ἐγὼ δ' ὅλος ἐξεθαμβήθην ἰδὼν. 4 Ὁ δέ μοι φησιν “Ὑσμινία, ἰδοὺ τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἔχεις,” καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ταύτης τῇ δεξιᾷ μου χειρὶ παραθεῖς ἀπέπτῃ μου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ τοὺς ὕπνους συμμεθελκόμενος. (*H&H* 6.17–18)

17 So Kratisthenes left the chamber and I stretched out completely on the couch while I had a whole sea of thoughts heaving through my soul, and I was like a ship tossed around by waves and storms; 2 I despaired, I rejoiced, I was terrified, I grew bold, I was completely full of happiness and fear; the thought of success gladdened my soul exceedingly, the thought of failure dejected me excessively.

18 In the midst of these billows, these seas and storms, sleep overwhelmed my eyes and I saw in my chamber an innumerable host of youths and maidens, their heads garlanded with roses, their hands linked in line, and singing a tune such as the Sirens sing. The tune was a hymn to Eros and an encomium of Aphrodite. The song was like a wedding ode, such as the Erotes sing in a bridal chamber. 2 The throng sang the melody and filled my soul with pleasure and passionate delight. It was as though I was completely in an erotic frenzy. 3 In the midst of this brilliant, graceful mingled throng, in the midst of the garlands and the song, in the midst of the passionate melodies, I saw once again seated on his lofty throne Eros, clad in imperial robes, and leading Hysmine by the hand. I was totally astonished at the sight. 4 He said to me, ‘Hysminias, see, you have Hysmine’, and put her hand in my right hand; with that he flew away from my sight, taking sleep with him.

We should note here how the imagery of the stormy sea (6.17.1 and 6.18.1) anticipates the coming storm and sacrifice, still unknown to Hysminias the hero, but certainly known to Hysminias the narrator.<sup>60</sup> The mentioning of the Sirens in 6.18.1 probably has the same function: it is not primarily an allusion to the Homeric episode,<sup>61</sup> but rather emphasises the imminent

<sup>60</sup> Cf. also Hysmine's paradoxically expressed feelings for the dolphin in *H&H* 11.13.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Conca (1994a) 598, n. 14, with a reference to *Od.* 12.41–45.



threat of the sea.<sup>62</sup> The words of Eros, 'Ἵσμινία, ἰδοὺ τὴν Ἵσμινην ἔχεις, "Hysminias, see, you have Hysmine", should be compared to his words to Hysmine in *H&H* 3.1.6, ἔχεις ἐραστήν, "you have your lover."

Eros hands over Hysmine to Hysminias once more, again in a dream, after Hysminias has been put ashore and fallen asleep on the beach. The first part of the passage has already been quoted above, as an anticipation of Hysmine's rescue; let us now look at the closing of the passage:

[...] τὴν Ἵσμινην ἀνέχων πρὸ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ ὡς ἐκ θαλάσσης ὕγρὰν καὶ λελουμένην ταῖς Χάρισι, καὶ ταῖς ἐμαῖς ταύταις χερσὶ παρατίθεται· ἐγὼ δ' ὡς τὴν Ἵσμινην λαβὼν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς ἐξάνεστην τῶν ὕπνων· τὰ δ' ἦσαν πάντα καὶ πάλιν ὄνειροι δουλεύοντες Ἐρωτι. (*H&H* 7.19)

[...], holding Hysmine in his hands, damp from the sea and washed by the Graces, and placed her in these hands of mine. But I, just as I took hold of Hysmine, woke up from my dream in delight. And all this, once again, was but a dream in the service of Eros.

It is not just a dream, as it turns out later, and the passage prepares for the reader's assumption that Hysmine has been or will be saved. Finally, we have the real wedding, when Hysmine is handed over by Eros for the third and last time. The wedding is described in a highly rhetorical manner, repeating and recalling previous passages and events:

Καὶ οὕτως ἐξ Ἀρτυκώμιδος γινόμεθα περὶ τὴν Ἀυλίκωμιν καὶ θύομεν τοὺς γάμους πολυτελῶς ἐν μέσῳ τῷ τοῦ Σωσθένους κήπῳ, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τραπέζῃ καὶ φρέατι, οἷς πρῶτον ἐρωτικὴν παστάδα κατεπηξάμεθα.

19 Ὁρθὴ γοῦν πᾶσα πόλις Ἀυλίκωμις, ὑμνοῦσα κροτοῦσα χαίρουσα, ὀρχομένη πρὸ τῆς παστάδος, πρὸ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, πρὸ τῶν νυμφίων ἡμῶν, ᾤδῃν ὑμέναιον ᾄδουσα, ἐπιθαλάμιον ἀλαλάζουσα καὶ λαμπρὸν ἀγαλλομένη γαμήλιον. 2 Τίς οὖν οὕτω καὶ τὴν μοῦσαν ἡδὺς καὶ τὴν φωνὴν μεγαλόφωνος καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀττικευομένην ἔχων ὡς τὰ πολλὰ καὶ κομψευομένην ὑπόσεμνα, ὡς καταζωγραφεῖν τῷ λόγῳ τοὺς γάμους καὶ ὅλους αὐτοὺς διαγράφεσθαι; 3 Θεῶν ἦν οὕτως ἐκείνῃ παστάς, Ἦρας γάμος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης νυμφών. Ἐγὼ δ' ἔχαιρον οὕτω λαμπρῶς καὶ λίαν φιλοτίμως νυμφοστολούμενος, καὶ μᾶλλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν Ἵσμινην Ἐρωσ συνενυμφοστόλησέ μοι πολυτελῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς συνεκάθισε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς μοι συνεστεφάνωσεν. 4 Ἀλλ' ἡνυχόμην πέρας τὰ τῆς τραπέζης εὐρεῖν καὶ νῆ τὸν Ἐρωτα τὴν ἡμέραν ἐμίσησα τὴν νύχτα ζητῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς κωμωδίας μικρὸν ὑπαλλάξας ὑπεψιθύρισα 'ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῆς ἡμέρας ὅσον.'

<sup>62</sup> Cf. *H&H* 7.10.5 where the ship is about to be wrecked: οὕτως ναὺς αὕτη νεκροπομπὸς εἰς Αἴδου μεταγούσα, οὕτως παστὰς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Περσεφόνης νυμφών, οὕτως μυθευομένη Σειρήν, "truly this ship is the funerary vessel that conveys us to Hades, truly it is Aphrodite's bridal bower and Persephone's marriage chamber, truly it is the Siren of the myth." Cf. also *L&K* 1.8.2; 3.10.3; 6.10.4. See also below, p. 264.

20 Οὕτω μὲν οὖν μοι τὰ τῶν γάμων ὑπὲρ τὴν Ὀμήρου μεγαλοφωνίαν, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μούσαν, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν γλώσσαν κατεστομωμένην ῥητορικῶς. (*H&H* 11.18.2–11.20.1)

And so we came from Artykomis to Aulikomis, where we celebrated the wedding magnificently, in the middle of Sosthenes' garden, at that very table and fountain where we had first laid the foundations of our erotic bridal chamber.

19 So the whole city of Aulikomis was in a state of excitement, singing, applauding, rejoicing, dancing before the bower, before the bridal chamber, before us the bridal couple, singing the wedding ode, chanting the marriage songs, and creating a glorious marriage scene. 2 Whose muse is so sweet, whose voice so eloquent, whose speech usually so refined in the Attic style and eloquent in the appropriate manner that he can depict in words the wedding and describe it in its entirety? 3 That was truly a bower of the gods, Hera's wedding, Aphrodite's bridal bower. I rejoiced to be arrayed so brilliantly and honourably for the bridal procession, and even more so because Eros escorted Hysmine for me in splendour and made her sit beside me in imperial magnificence and crowned her with me in glory. 4 But I prayed that the banquet would reach its conclusion and by Eros, I hated the day and sought for night and, changing the words of the comedy a little, I whispered, 'O king Zeus, how drawn out are day's affairs.'

20 And so my wedding defied the grandiloquence of Homer, every muse and every tongue made eloquent by rhetoric.

The wedding is described with words similar to those used in the description of the dream in 5.2.<sup>63</sup> The passage also repeats, in 11.19.1, the festive processions that Hysminias has experienced so many times already. The expression Ἀφροδίτης νυμφών, "Aphrodite's bridal bower" has been used earlier, then in a negative context.<sup>64</sup> The change in the word's connotations may symbolise a restoration of the erotic balance: the couple are reunited, not in Hades but in the garden of Sosthenes, where Eros first gave them to each other.

The repetition of Hysminias' festival experiences is indeed conspicuous.<sup>65</sup> The processions have already been described several times throughout the novel with the same vocabulary, starting with *H&H* 1.2.1 (departure from Eurykomis) and 1.3.1–2 (arrival at Aulikomis): 5.7; 5.8; 8.19; 8.21.4–9.3; 9.4.3–9.5; 10.5; 10.7.

<sup>63</sup> Especially the beginning of the passage: ἄλλος παστάδα κατέπηξε, νυμφοστολήσας ταύτην λαμπρῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως νυμφαγωγήσας, καὶ στεφανώσας μοι τὴν Ὑσμίνην μεγαλοπρεπῶς συνεκάθισε καὶ τράπεζαν παρετίθετο κτλ. For the whole passage and translation, see above, p. 66.

<sup>64</sup> Of the stormy sea in *H&H* 7.10.5; cf. *L&K* 5.16.3–6 (in an erotic context).

<sup>65</sup> See above, pp. 57–58, 60–62.



A similar repetition may be seen in Hysminias' dreams of Hysmine, in which her behaviour is paraphrased (*H&H* 3.4.2–7; 3.5.1–6). We will look in closer detail at the first example.

ἂν θλίψῃ τὸν δάκτυλον, ἀντιθλιβήσεται γενναιότερον. Ἄλλ' ἔθλιψε χθές. Ναὶ θλιβέτω καὶ πάλιν. Ἄν θλίψῃ, θλιβήσεται· εἰ δ' οὐ θλίψει, θλιβήσεται. 3 Ἄν τὸν πόδα ταύτης ἐπιθήσῃ μου τῷ ποδί, τοῖν ποδοῖν ἐγὼ προσεπιθήσω τὸν ἕτερον· ἂν 'χαίροις' εἴπῃ, 'ἐκατονταχαίροις' ἀκούσει· ἂν τὸ προσκύνημα κλέψῃ, προσκυνηθήσεται φανερώς· ἂν προεκροφῇ μου τοῦ ποτηρίου, ὅλην ἐκροφήσω τὴν κόρην αὐτός· 4 ἂν ἐπέχῃ τὴν κύλικα, καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τῆς κόρης τῷ ποτηρίῳ συνεφελέσσομαι· ἂν τοὺς πόδας συνέχῃ καὶ συνέχουσα θλίβῃ καὶ θλίβουσα φιλήῃ καὶ φιλοῦσα κλέπτῃ τὸ φίλημα, συνέξω καὶ γὰρ καὶ θλίψω καὶ θλίβων φιλήσω, πλὴν οὐχ ὑποκλέψω τὸ φίλημα· 5 ἂν γαργαλίῃ μου τὸν πόδα, καταγαργαλίσω τὴν κόρην αὐτός, καὶ πείσω ταύτην ἐξ ἡδονῆς ἀνακαγχάσαι καὶ ἔρωτος· ἂν μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον ἀλγήσῃ τὸν πόδα, ἂν δευτέρα τοῦ πατρὸς ἐρχομένη μονωθῇ τῆς μητρὸς, ἐπιλάβωμαι τοῦ πληγέντος ποδός, 6 καταφιλήσω τὸ τραῦμα, τὴν πληγὴν πολυπραγμονήσω, ζητήσω τὰ πρόσφορα φάρμακα, κατεπιθήσω ταῦτα, τὴν οὐλὴν καταμαλάξω πᾶσαν ἱατρικῶς, ἐπιστημονικῶς ἐρευνήσω καὶ ὅλην ἰάσομαι. 7 Οὐκέτι τὸν θυμὸν ὑφέξω τοῦ Ἔρωτος, οὐκέτι κατονειδισθήσομαι τὸν παρθένον, οὐκέτι τὸν σῶφρονα κατεριωνευθήσομαι καὶ τᾶλλ' ὅποσα νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα πέπονθα. Ἄν τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νυκτὶ ζητήσῃ, συγκοιμηθήσομαι τῇ παρθένῳ, καὶ νήδυμον τὸν ὕπνον ἀνακηρύξω ποιητικῶς. Ἦδη δέ μοι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σπένδεται, καὶ ἦδη κοιμῶμαι. (*H&H* 3.4.2–7)

If she squeezes my finger, she will be squeezed more firmly in return. But she did squeeze it yesterday! Very well, let her squeeze it yet again; if she does, she will be squeezed; but if she doesn't, she will still be squeezed. 3 If she puts her foot on mine, I'll add my other foot to the two already there. If she says, 'Welcome', she will hear 'A hundred times welcome.' If she greets me surreptitiously, she will be greeted openly. If she drinks from the cup before me, I'll drink the whole girl down myself. 4 If she holds the goblet back, I'll grab hold of her hand as well as the goblet. And if she keeps hold of my feet, and squeezes them as she holds them, and as she squeezes them kisses them, and as she kisses them steals other kisses, then I too will keep hold and squeeze and as I squeeze will kiss; except that I will not steal my kiss. 5 If she tickles my foot, I too will tickle the girl, and I will make her burst out laughing from pleasure and passion. If at dinner her foot hurts, if as she goes out behind her father she is separated from her mother, I will take hold of the sore foot, 6 I will kiss the hurt, I will make a fuss of the wound, I will ask for the right ointments, I will put them on, I will soothe the scar like a doctor, I will make a learned investigation and I will make it all better. 7 I won't put up with Eros' wrath any more, I won't be reproached any more for my virginity, I won't be made fun of any more for my chastity, and all the other things, by Eros, that I have put up with. If she is looking for what is appropriate for the night, I will go and sleep with the maiden and I will proclaim in poetic manner that sleep is sweet. But sleep is already being poured over my eyes, I am already falling asleep.

The incidents that Hysminias refers to took place in books 1 and 2: 1.8.3–9; 1.12.3–4; 2.12–13. The dream in book 3 includes an inversion: Hysminias will now repeat all the actions that Hysmine has performed, and to which he previously responded negatively. Accordingly, this is not just repetition with variation, but a case of elaborate amplification. Let us look at each action that Hysminias claims he will perform, and at its previous version.

1. *He will squeeze her finger.* Hysminias' finger was squeezed in 1.11.3: *προτείνω τὴν χεῖρα λαβεῖν, ἣ δὲ τὸν δάκτυλον ἐπιθλίβει μου καὶ θλίβουσα στένει καὶ φύσημα λεπτὸν ὡς ἐκ καρδίας φυσᾷ*, "I held out my hand to take the cup and she pressed my finger, and as she did so she moaned and breathed a gentle sigh as if from the heart." This is also one of the events that will happen later: Hysmine's hand will be squeezed by Hysminias in 4.1.3.

2. *He will squeeze her foot.* Hysminias' foot was squeezed in 1.9.1: *καὶ τὸν πόδα ταύτης ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμὸν ἐπιτέθεικε καὶ προσεπέθλιβεν ἐφ' ὅσον ἐγὼ τοῦ πόματος ἔπιον*, "and she placed her foot against mine, and kept it there for as long as I drank from the cup." This too will come true: Hysminias will squeeze Hysmine's foot in 4.1.1–2.

3. *He will say "a hundred times welcome".* At the very first meeting in 1.8.3, Hysminias is bidden welcome by Hysmine: *ἦκεν οὖν ἡ παρθένος καὶ παρατιθεμένη μοι τὸ ποτήριον 'χαίροις' ὑπεψιθύρισεν· ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας εἶπον οὐδέν*, "so the girl came up and, placing the cup beside me, whispered, 'Welcome.' I heard her, though I made no reply."

4. *He will greet her openly.* Hysmine calls Hysminias "herald with the same name" in 1.8.3, and repeats the epithet in a greeting in 2.12.2: *ἦκεν ἡ κόρη κιρνῶσα καὶ 'χαίροις, συνώνυμέ μοι κήρυξ' ὑπεψιθύρισε*, "the girl came up to pour out the wine and 'Welcome, herald with the same name as mine,' she whispered." Unlike her, he will not whisper but speak openly.

5. *He will "drink the whole girl down"* if she first drinks from his cup. This is the only event that has not yet taken place; it will, however, occur in book 5 (5.10.3–5.11). Hysminias will then "drink down the girl" in 5.11.4 and 5.12.3.

6. *He will grasp her hand if she holds back the cup.* The episode of Hysmine holding back the cup took place in 1.9.2–3, and it ended in the girl's shame and her parents' reproaches.

7. *He will play with her feet.* Hysmine played with the herald's feet in 1.12.3–4; Hysminias recalls this event in 5.14.2–3.

8. *He will take care of her hurt foot.* In 2.14.1 Hysmine pretends to stumble over her foot, so that she gets a moment alone with Hysminias to say *πείσθητι τῷ πατρί*, "obey my father." There is a sexual connotation



hidden here. Hysmine refers to her father saying “let us make *due offerings to the night*”, τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νυκτί (2.13.3). This is at first, of course, understood as sleep, but when Hysminias says in 3.4.7 “if she is looking for what is appropriate for the night (τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νυκτί), I will go and sleep with the maiden [...]”, we understand how he, and possibly Hysmine, understood her father.<sup>66</sup>

9. *He will no longer put up with Eros’ wrath or be made fun of for his chastity*: Eros expressed his anger in the dream (3.1). Kratisthenes made fun of Hysminias’ ignorance (1.14.5) and reproached his chastity (Sophrosyne) (2.14.4–6).

So all the actions that Hysminias describes here have already been enacted (with the exception of no. 5), but in a slightly different manner and in different situations. The amplification of textual elements most probably signifies an augmentation of emotional and sexual intensity. We must also note that the same events have already been retold by Hysminias in regular recapitulations, and furthermore, that yet another paraphrase of the “same” series of events appears in *H&H* 3.5.1–6.

There are other examples of similar repetitions or doublings. In *H&H* 4.25, 4.21.3–4 is repeated in a compressed and negated version:

Καὶ πάλιν κατεφίλουν αὐτήν, καὶ πάλιν συνέσφιγγον καὶ ὅλην εἶλκον πρὸς ἑαυτόν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν μετεβίβαζον, καὶ τοῖς δακτύλοις κατέθλιβον, καὶ ὅλην κατέδακνον, ὅλην ἀνερρόφουν τοῖς χεῖλεσι καὶ ὅλος ὅλην ὡς κιττὸς συνεῖχον κυπάριττον· 4 συνεπλεκόμεν τῇ κόρῃ, συνερριζούμεν αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἐζήτουν κοινώσασθαι καὶ ἤθελον ὅλην καταφαγεῖν καὶ ὅλην αὐτὴν κατερεύεσθαι· ὅλην ἦγον περὶ τὸ χεῖλος καὶ ὡς ἐκ σίμβλου τοῦ χείλους τῆς κόρης μέλι γλυκάζον ἐτρύγων τοῖς χεῖλεσιν. (*H&H* 4.21.3–4)

And I embraced her again and clasped her again and held her very close to me and quite transported her into my soul and squeezed her with my fingers and nibbled at her and quaffed her with my lips and altogether was caught up with her like ivy round a cypress. 4 I was entwined with the girl, I was rooted in her, and I sought to unite our being and I wanted to devour her completely, and gulp her down. I pressed her to my lip and I harvested sweet honey on my lips from the hive that was the girl’s lip.

[...] ‘οὐκέτι τὴν καλὴν Ὑσμίνην καταφιλήσω, οὐκέτι καταθλίψω τοὺς δακτύλους ἐρωτικῶς, οὐκέτι κατὰ κιττὸν συμπλακήσομαι, οὐκέτι νέκταρ, ἀλλὰ κόνδυ πικρίας κατακεράσομαι, 2 οὐκέτι τρυγήσω τοῦ μέλιτος, οὐκέτι τῷ

<sup>66</sup> Cf. also *H&H* 11.19.4: νῆ τὸν Ἑρωτα τὴν ἡμέραν ἐμίσησα τὴν νύκτα ζητῶν, “by Eros, I hated the day and sought for night”; cf. Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1–2.

κέντρῳ πληγῆσομαι, οὐκ ἐκροφήσω τὴν κόρην τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἃ πάντα σπου-  
δάζων ἐρωτικῶς ἐπαιζόν.' [...] (*H&H* 4.25)

[...] 'I shall never embrace the fair Hysmine again, I shall never clasp her fingers in passion, I shall never be entwined with her like ivy, I shall pour not nectar but a cup of bitterness, 2 I shall never harvest her honey, I shall never be wounded by her sting, nor shall I quaff the girl with my lips—all of which I pursued so eagerly in my passionate sport.' [...]

A similar pair of erotic passages are the dream in *H&H* 5.1 and the "playing" in 5.16; the erotic embrace in 5.16 seems to be modelled upon the dream that Hysminias described in 5.1. In the same book there is an interesting example in which not only the first passage is textually paraphrased in a new version, but also Hysminias remarks on the similarity: Hysminias sees "an innumerable host of maidens" in the garden of Sosthenes and he is reminded of the dream (*H&H* 3.1) in which he saw Hysmine, crowned with roses in "a crowd of inestimable size, a mixed throng of men, women, youths, maidens":

Εἶδον οὖν καὶ νῆ τὸν τύραννον Ἐρωτα τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτὸν ὁρᾶν ἐδόκουν τὸν  
ὄνειρον· καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεφύσῃσα, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὴν  
Ἑσμίνην εἶδον ἐν μέσῳ κατὰ σελήνην ἐν ἄστρασι, τᾶλλα μὲν κατακεκοσμη-  
μένην βασιλικῶς, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἐκ δάφνης ἐστεφανωμένην παρθενικῶς.  
(*H&H* 5.6.3)

I looked, and by the despot Eros, I thought I recognized the dream in these events; and I would have all but expired had I not seen Hysmine in their midst, like the moon amidst the stars, in all other respects dressed like an empress but with her head crowned like a maiden with laurel.

It is obvious from these examples that doubling and repetition, quite often with inversion and amplification, have played a crucial role in the composition of *H&H*. Repetition and doubling are examples of what modern theoretical terminology refers to as spatial devices.<sup>67</sup> The repetition of parts of his own text, the "auto-mimesis" that Makrembolites employs so intensely, reminds us of the epics, and also of the lyrical genres.<sup>68</sup> Spatial elements such as repetition and delay of time contribute in making a text artful, which in its turn makes the intrigue appear less important. These elements, along with the extensive number of rhetorical figures, have probably contributed

<sup>67</sup> See above, pp. 40–41.

<sup>68</sup> One should note that poetical language is not the only way to define a lyrical novel; see the spatial features of the so-called lyrical novel in Freedman (1963) esp. 1–17. On *H&H* as "poetry in prose", see Plepelits (1989) 70, 74. See also Meunier (1991) 15–17 on the poetic "refrains" in *H&H*.



to the assessment of *H&H* as boring, artificial, and laboured.<sup>69</sup> We should bear in mind that several rhetorical devices are based on repetitive principles and that the overall rhetorical character of Makrembolites' novel thus reflects and underlines the doubling of the plot and the repetition of episodes.<sup>70</sup>

The function of the repetition of episodes in *H&H*, as pointed out earlier, is not to remind the reader of the previous events.<sup>71</sup> Instead it emphasises the novel itself as a work of art<sup>72</sup> and produces an element of insecurity or vagueness in the intrigue, as the narrator shifts from reality to dream, from dream to reality.<sup>73</sup> Lexical repetitions give the text an epic or lyrical atmosphere and underline the novel's central events.<sup>74</sup>

#### THE CLOSURE

If the opening passage (*H&H* 1.1.1–1.2.1) can be called a prologue, the closing of the novel could certainly be called an epilogue: the narrative proper ends with the wedding at 11.19, after which follows a prayer to the pagan gods.<sup>75</sup>

Οὕτω μὲν οὖν μοι τὰ τῶν γάμων ὑπὲρ τὴν Ὀμήρου μεγαλοφονίαν, ὑπὲρ  
πάσαν μούσαν, ὑπὲρ πάσαν γλῶσσαν κατεστομωμένην ῥητορικῶς. Ἀλλ', ὦ  
Ζεῦ, οὐ κήρυξ ἦκον εἰς ταυτηνὴ τὴν Αὐλίκωμιν, ὦ τύραννε Ἐρως, οὐ δοῦλος  
ἐξ Αὐλικώμιδος ταύτης εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἐπανῆκον Εὐρύκωμιν, 2 ὦ Πόσειδον ὁ

<sup>69</sup> See above, pp. 15–16 and 50, n. 17.

<sup>70</sup> There will be no attempt in this study to deal with rhetoric or style in any detail. On rhetorical figures in *H&H*, see Hilberg (1876) xxi–xxvi on *De ornamentis rhetoricis*, xxiii–xxiv on *Tropi*, xxiv–xxvi on *Figurae verborum* and *sententiarum*; Plepelits (1989) 73–76; Roilos (2000) on the role of rhetoric in the Komnenian novels; Meunier (1991) 11–12 on style and rhetorical pathos in *H&H*. See also above, p. 44, n. 201. On rhetoric and its importance in Byzantine education, see e.g. Hunger (1981); Kustas (1970, 1973); Kennedy (1981); Schouler (1995).

<sup>71</sup> See above, p. 63.

<sup>72</sup> On literary texts as works of art, see Ingarden (1960) esp. 25–196 on the composition of the artistic text, and Lotman (1977) esp. 94–208 on different kinds of repetition in the artistic text. Cf. also above, p. 42 and n. 193 on the poetic principle of Roman Jakobson.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Poljakova (1979) 110.

<sup>74</sup> On repetition of words, see above, p. 57 and n. 42. Cf. Poljakova (1979) 106–108, who argues that repetition in *H&H* has a function *contrary* to the traditional one, i.e. that it weakens or even negates the significance of the events. This view should, however, be seen within the framework of Poljakova's interpretation of the novel as an allegory.

<sup>75</sup> Zeus, Eros, Poseidon, Apollo, Artemis, and Gaia, all of whom have been mentioned, even when not really participating in the story. Tyche is not mentioned here; cf. above, pp. 53–55. See Meunier (1991) 26–28 on the functions of the ancient gods in *H&H*, and Harder (2000) on religion and faith in the Komnenian novels, including magic and theological discussion, esp. pp. 67–69 on *H&H*.

ταυτηνὴ τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἐν σάλῳ λύτρον λαβών, ὦ μέγ' Ἀπολλων ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῖν χαρίζομενος, ὦ τόξον Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ πηγὴ τὴν παρθένον ἐλέγχουσα, μὴ βυθὸς ἀμνηστίας κατεπικλύσῃ ταῦτα τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, μὴ χρόνος μακρὸς, μὴ ῥυτίς, μὴ λήθης κρατὴρ ἐν Ἀΐδου κινώμενος. (H&H 11.20)

And so my wedding defied the grandiloquence of Homer, every muse and every tongue made eloquent by rhetoric. But, o Zeus, as whose herald I came to Aulikomis, o tyrant Eros, as whose slave I returned to my Eurykomis from Aulikomis, 2 o Poseidon, who took Hysmine as a ransom in the storm, o great Apollo who bestowed freedom on us, o bow of Artemis and spring which judged her virginity, do not let an abyss of oblivion overwhelm our adventures, nor the passage of time nor decay nor the cup of Lethe mixed in Hades.

The narrator wishes that his story may not fall into oblivion. This *topos* was well established in ancient historiography, through which it reached Byzantine literature.<sup>76</sup> The use of the *topos* here may have a double function: besides creating a sense of authenticity it also underlines the formal analogy between narrative and historiography.<sup>77</sup> The narrator, however, does not believe that the gods will immortalise the protagonists, obviously because of their service to Eros: Zeus is angry because of the “exchange” of Zeus for Eros,<sup>78</sup> Poseidon is afraid of showing his defeat (Eros saved Hysmine from him),<sup>79</sup> and Mother Earth is afraid of Poseidon.<sup>80</sup> He thus rests his hopes on the art of rhetoric.

Τοίνυν εἰ Ζεὺς οὐ καταστερίσει τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς, εἰ Ποσειδῶν οὐ καταστηλογραφήσει τοῖς ὕδασι, εἰ Γῇ μὴ φυτουργήσει τοῖς φυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄνθεσιν, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐν ἀμαράντοις ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις ἀδάμασιν Ἑρμοῦ γραφίδι καὶ μέλανι καὶ γλώσση πῦρ πνεοῦσῃ ῥητορικὸν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς στηλογραφήθησεται, καὶ τις

<sup>76</sup> Agapitos (1991) 95 refers to the prefaces of Prokopios, Anna Komnene, and Georgios Akropolites; see also Conca (1994a) 684, n. 9.

<sup>77</sup> Conca (1994a) 684, n. 9. On the ancient novel and related genres such as historiography, see e.g. Holzberg (1996) with references.

<sup>78</sup> Ἄλλ' ὦ κατέψευσαι τὸ κηρύκειον, Ἐρωτα παῖδα Διὸς ἀντηλλαξάμην πατρός, καὶ Ζεὺς οὐ καταστερίσει τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ μνήμην οὐκ ἐπινεύσει χάρισασθαι, “but, alas, I betrayed my herald’s wand and exchanged the father Zeus for his child Eros, and Zeus will not place us among the stars and allow memory of us to be preserved in heaven” (H&H 11.21.3).

<sup>79</sup> Ἄλλ' αἰδῶ τὴν ἦτταν καὶ δέδοικας μὴ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς καταζωγραφῶν στηλογραφῆσῃς τὰ κατὰ σου, “but you are ashamed of defeat and you dread that in depicting our adventures you lay yourself open to mockery” (H&H 11.21.4).

<sup>80</sup> Ἄλλ' ἐνοσίχθιος ὁ Ποσειδῶν, ἀλλ' ἐνοσίχθων, καὶ καταβρυχήσεται σου τρόπον λέοντος, καὶ κατακυκήσει σε τὴν μητέρα στηλογραφοῦσαν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἐξ Ἐρωτος καταφαναλίζουσαν ἦτταν αὐτοῦ, “but Poseidon the earth-stirrer, the earth-shaker will unleash his lion’s roar against you and will shatter you, the mother who depicted our adventures and his demeaning defeat by Eros” (H&H 11.22.3).



τῶν ὀψιγόνων καταρρηγορεύσει ταῦτα καὶ ὡς ἀθανάτῳ στήλῃ τοῖς λόγοις ἀνδριάντα χαλκουργήσει κατάχρυσον.

23 "Ὅσον μὲν οὖν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐρωτικώτερον, τῶν πολλῶν ἐρωτικῶν χαρίτων ἡμᾶς ἀποδέξεται, καὶ ὅσον παρθενικὸν καὶ σεμνότερον, τῆς σωφροσύνης πάλιν ἀγάσεται· 2 ὅσον δὲ συμπαθέστερον, ἐλεήσει τῶν δυστυχημάτων ἡμᾶς, καὶ οὕτως ἡμῖν ἔσται τὰ τῆς μνήμης ἀθάνατα. 3 Ἡμεῖς δὲ καταχαριτώσομεν τὴν γραφὴν καὶ ὅλην τὴν βίβλον κατακοσμήσομεν καὶ χάρισιν ἐρωτικαῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσα βίβλους κοσμοῦσι καὶ τοὺς λόγους κατακαλλύνουσι· κλήσις δ' ἔσται τῇ βίβλῳ τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην δράμα καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ.<sup>81</sup> (*H&H* 11.22.4–11.23)

So, if Zeus will not place our deeds among the stars, if Poseidon will not inscribe them in the waves, if Earth will not embody them in plants and flowers, our adventures will be set forth in imperishable tablets and slabs of adamant, with the pen and ink of Hermes and a tongue which breathes the fire of rhetoric. And anyone from a later generation will be able to retell these matters and will be able to forge a golden statue in words, like an imperishable image.

23 Whatever is most responsive to passion in men, will appreciate the many passionate elements in this story; whatever is chaste and virginal, will respond to the chaste elements; 2 whatever is more inclined to sympathy, will pity our misfortunes, and so memory of us will be undying. 3 We will grace this story and adorn this book with erotic charms and everything else that adorns books and beautifies words. And the title of this book will be 'The adventures of Hysmine and of me, Hysminias'.

Seen from the fictional world's angle, i.e. the framing narrating act, this is not the end of the book, because at this point the book has not yet been written. It is the fictional narrator's end of his story, urging someone else to write it down as a book. We must note that the author distinguishes between the story (i.e. the actual events) that is to be depicted "with the pen and ink of Hermes", and the handing down of that story to a later generation that will produce the book—the golden statue to admire and imitate.<sup>82</sup> The passage closes the narrative frame opened in book 1 with the address to Charidoux. Such a frame should have suited an oral performance, and the exhortation to write down the story as a book with the aid of rhetorical art should have pleased a learned audience, signalling that the text—even if

<sup>81</sup> Cf. the version in Oxon. Baroc. 131 (E), fol. 507v, quoted by Agapitos (1998a) 145: κλήσις δ' ἔσται τῇ βίβλῳ τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δράμα. On the MSS, see Agapitos (2000a) 183, n. 55. Hilberg's edition, reprinted in Conca (1994a), is based on Vat. gr. 1114 (G) and its family; *H&H* 11.23.3 is there probably influenced by 11.22.2: τῶν καθ' Ὑσμίνην ταύτην καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ, ὅλον δράμα τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς κτλ.

<sup>82</sup> On the wish for immortality and the image of the statue, see Agapitos (1991) 95; Agapitos & Smith (1992) 43 and n. 93; Cupane (1996) 101.

orally performed—belonged in a manuscript-culture where rhetoric played a crucial role.

The passage is difficult, and the discussions of it have all evolved around the position of rhetoric in the novel. Beaton sees the passage as the final and definite expression of the novel's main theme, which is the art of rhetoric.<sup>83</sup> The theme of rhetoric has been anticipated already in the closing commentaries on the wedding: "and so my wedding defied the grandiloquence of Homer, every muse and every tongue made eloquent by rhetoric" (*H&H* 11.20.1).<sup>84</sup> It has also recurred throughout the novel. There are, however, further aspects of the passage that need to be considered.

The epilogue functions as a commentary to the story, and a number of elements are being tied together in just a few paragraphs. Not all of them are obvious, for example the figure used in *H&H* 11.22.4: "with the pen and ink of Hermes". It is easy to read it only as a metaphor for the art of rhetoric, but we should remember that Hermes was the protector of both heralds and orators, and that the expression thus may refer back to both Hysminias the protagonist and Hysminias the narrator.<sup>85</sup> The metaphor thus reflects both the double function of the hero-narrator and the art of rhetoric by means of which the story is depicted.

The opening prayer to the gods is also important for our understanding of the passage: not only does it pick up recurrent motifs from the novel, but it also helps us understand the work's character: what will be immortalised is not traditional, heroic or mythic acts, but the service to Eros, i.e. a new kind of "heroic epic" with a new kind of hero.<sup>86</sup> We must note, in this context, the echo from Longus in *H&H* 11.23.1–2, establishing a generic background for the device.<sup>87</sup> The allusion to Longus also underlines the image of

<sup>83</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 85–87.

<sup>84</sup> Quoted above, pp. 74–75.

<sup>85</sup> Agapitos & Smith (1992) 43; cf. Plepelits (1989) 194, n. 154. Cf. also *H&H* 4.20.3 (Ἐρμοῦ μοι ἀκόντιον), 2.3.3 (γραφεῖον Ἄρεος) and 4.13.3 (γηπόνων ἀνδρῶν γραφεῖον).

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 86, "it is the art of rhetoric and not the discredited mythology [...] that can immortalize the [...] love of the hero and heroine [...]." On the transformation of desire into rhetorical performance in Longus, see Alpers (1996) 328. Cf. also the lyrical novel and its "symbolic hero"; Freedman (1963) 19–23, 57–72.

<sup>87</sup> Longus, *D&C prooem.* 3: κτῆμα δὲ τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται, καὶ λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, τὸν ἐρασθέντα ἀναμνήσει, τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει, "[...] and something for mankind to possess and enjoy. It will cure the sick, comfort the distressed, stir the memory of those who have loved, and educate those who haven't." See Agapitos (2000a) 183. Trans. by Gill in Reardon (1989). We may note the transference of the device from the preface of Longus to the epilogue of



narrative as painting, painting as narrative, which is a central aspect of the poetics of *H&H*.<sup>88</sup>

The imagery of writing as painting recurs throughout the novel, and here it is explicitly expressed in the equation of *γραφὴν* with *βίβλον* in *H&H* 11.23.3. Furthermore, the *sphragis*, the “seal” that closes the book, read in the Baroccianus version (E),<sup>89</sup> emphasises additionally the novel’s relation to painting. Τὸ καθ’ Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δράμα (“the *drama* of Hysmine and Hysminias”) is a twelve-syllable iambic verse that in its turn reflects the verse inscriptions accompanying the paintings in Sosthenes’ garden.<sup>90</sup> The author has provided the book with an inscription as has the artist his paintings.<sup>91</sup>

The epilogue and its *sphragis* may be referred to as *paratextual*. This term originates with Genette and includes, for example, titles, subtitles, intertitles, prefaces, dedications, and commentaries.<sup>92</sup> In ancient literature the paratext was most often incorporated into the text and not separated from the narration, but in the Hellenistic period it grew more important thanks to the metatextual character of that literature.<sup>93</sup> In the ancient novels paratextual devices were generally used to give a sense of historiographic authenticity to the fiction.<sup>94</sup> We will investigate those aspects of the epilogue in further detail in chapter 2.2.2, in comparison with *L&K* and other ancient novels.

Due to its peculiar status, we will return to the epilogue a number of times throughout this study.

---

Makrembolites, and compare it to the historiographic *topos* in 11.20.2, which also was moved from opening to closure; see above, p. 75 and n. 76.

<sup>88</sup> Agapitos (2000a) 184; see further below, esp. pp. 130–135.

<sup>89</sup> On this MS, see above, p. 76, n. 81, and below, p. 185, n. 102.

<sup>90</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 145 and (2000a) 183–184.

<sup>91</sup> Agapitos (2000a) 184 takes it one step further: “Makrembolites places himself in his own text as the *ὀψίγονος* painter craftsman who has taken up the challenge to erect a visual monument of his verbal art.” Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 86: “the author, stepping out of the character of his narrator, recommends the book to his readers.”

<sup>92</sup> Genette (1987); cf. id. (1997) 3–4 and below, p. 168 on transtextuality. On paratextual endings in the ancient novel, see Fusillo (1997).

<sup>93</sup> Fusillo (1997) 211–212; Genette (1987) 152–154.

<sup>94</sup> Fusillo (1997) 212; cf. above, p. 75 on the historiographic *topos* in the epilogue of *H&H*.

### 1.2.3 Textual structure

We have already noted that *H&H* contains little action, and that it has been criticised for its uneventful content.<sup>95</sup> Narrative as a genre is traditionally based on causation and time, and there is very little “epic flow”, i.e. narrative in its traditional sense, in *H&H*. Makrembolites introduces a number of descriptive and spatial elements, and the plot is partly presupposed as part of the postulated reader’s knowledge of the ancient novels.

The chronological and causal character of narrative is, however, interrupted by its so-called *inclusiveness*: summary accounts of what is happening are, for example, interspersed with scenes in dialogue.<sup>96</sup> Especially when dealing with a text that does not contain much narrative in its traditional sense, it is useful to look at the different kinds of discourse, the text-types, that constitute a narrative. Traditionally, four types of narrative are distinguished: *scene* and *summary*, *description* and *commentary*.<sup>97</sup> Due to the particular descriptive and spatial character of *H&H*, it is important to find a method through which its nature may be defined. I have therefore partly adopted Seymour Chatman’s approach to narrative (Chatman 1990).

Chatman argues that there are three kinds of discourse in a narrative text: *narrative*, *description* and *argument* (= the traditional *commentary*).<sup>98</sup> Temporality is present in all narrative texts, but what, according to Chatman, makes “pure” narrative unique among the text-types is its so-called *chronologic*. By this he means a “doubly temporal logic”, i.e. narrative entails movement through time both externally (the duration of the presentation of the novel = narrative time) and internally (the duration of the sequence of events that constitute the plot = fictional time).<sup>99</sup> Non-narrative text-types, description and commentary, do not have the internal time sequence.

Part of Chatman’s study (chapters 1–4) is concerned with “textual service”, that is, the way in which the three text-types operate at each other’s service. In a narrative text, the narrative text-type is generally subserved by description and commentary, as the narrator digresses to describe or argue; the overriding text-type is still narrative. Usually narrative consists of two types: *scene* and *summary*.<sup>100</sup> Scene is the part of the text in which the nar-

<sup>95</sup> See above, p. 50 and n. 17.

<sup>96</sup> Wellek & Warren (1963<sup>3</sup>) 216.

<sup>97</sup> For the origin and use of the terms, see e.g. Hägg (1971a) 87–89; Bal (1985) 68–76.

<sup>98</sup> I will not adopt Chatman’s term “argument” but instead use the traditional “commentary”.

<sup>99</sup> Chatman (1990) 9. For a general discussion of the terms fictional and narrative time, see Hägg (1971a) 23–24, and see also below, p. 136.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Genette’s use of the same terms, (1980) 93–94; see below, p. 84, n. 112.



rator makes things happen under the reader's eyes, and summary is that in which the narrator says that things are happening, or happened.<sup>101</sup> The combination of different text-types and of different forms of narrative decides the tempo of a text: when description and scene are used we can expect the tempo to be slow; when summary is dominant the tempo is generally faster. The advantage of Chatman's approach is the strengthened position of description and commentary, considered not as types of narrative, but as text-types in close co-operation with narrative. When studying a Byzantine novel in which description and—although to a lesser degree—commentary play an important role, I believe that this is an appropriate method.

#### NARRATIVE

Even at first sight it is obvious that narrative in *H&H* is interspersed with descriptive detail. Although it is rather easy to define and to find examples of scene and summary, it is difficult to specify the borderline between the two.<sup>102</sup> Scene can consist of direct speech, dialogue and concrete detail. It often reports inner processes: what and how the character feels. Summary, on the other hand, tells the reader of events seen as if from a distance, thus generally not in great detail. These two types of narrative can be mixed freely in a text, ranging from rich detail to meagre summary.

As mentioned, the combination of scene and summary decides the tempo of a narrative. The first part of *H&H* (books 1–6) covers 6 days and nights of fictional time; the second part (books 7–9) covers a little more than one year; the last part (books 10–11) covers 7 days. The result is a slow tempo in books 1–6 and 10–11, and a fast tempo in books 7–9. The changes are gradual: book 7 displays a small increase of summary, as the action takes place in new surroundings; in book 8 the amount of summary is clearly increasing; in book 9 detailed summary recalls scene from book 1, but scene becomes more dominant towards the end of the book. There are, of course, exceptions: when, in book 2, we find less scene, a large part of the book is covered by the extensive ekphrasis, the tempo thus already being very slow; when, in book 8, we find large pieces of scene this is because Hysminias

---

<sup>101</sup> On scene and summary, also referred to as *showing* and *telling*, see e.g. Hägg (1971a) 87.

<sup>102</sup> See e.g. Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) 8: "the complex issues involved in this shift [sc. between different modes of narration] have been reduced to a convenient distinction between 'showing' [...] and 'telling' [...]." For a discussion of the problems related to the use of these terms, see Hägg (1971a) 87–8.

finds himself in new surroundings and the tempo slows down in order for him to describe his new situation. The use of scene is at the same time connected with the novel's emphasis on inner feelings and thoughts: when scene is limited, often in connection with journeys or everyday occupations, such as eating or sleeping, it consists mainly of speech, and summary becomes more detailed. Scene—particularly in the form of monologue, dialogue and inner thoughts—is a good medium to represent the characters' feelings and thoughts to the reader.

What is significant in *H&H* is the mixing of scene and summary. The transitions from scene to summary, summary to scene, are gradual and usually hard to pinpoint. One of the reasons why the borderlines between scene and summary are so hard to perceive in *H&H* is that small pieces of summary are inserted into larger pieces of scene, particularly in the first part of the novel, and likewise scene is inserted into summary, particularly in books 8–9.<sup>103</sup> One may argue, then, that the concept of scene and summary is not appropriate for a text in which the distinctions cannot be clearly shown, but in fact it can help us to see how the novel is *not* structured. As Booth points out, the line between showing and telling is always to some degree an arbitrary one: "everything he [the author] *shows* will serve to *tell*."<sup>104</sup> This is the case particularly with first-person narratives.<sup>105</sup> To investigate how scene and summary are shaped and how they function will still tell us something about the novel's texture.

Scene is the dominant type of narrative in *H&H*, quite often with extreme detail. One example of many is *H&H* 5.9–11, a long passage from which we will look at an extract. Hysmine and Hysminias engage in a love play at dinner, drinking alternately from the same cup.

ἡ δὲ κατὰ παρθένον ἄκροις δεξαμένη τὸ ἔκπωμα καὶ τοῖς χεῖλεσι παρθευικῶς προσεγγίσασα καὶ μόνον γευσασμένη τοῦ πόματος ὅλον ἀντιδέδωκε τὸ ποτήριον, παρθευικῆς αἰδοῦς καθυπουργησάσης τῷ πλάσματι. 3 Καὶ πρὸς Κρατισθένην ἐγὼ (οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐμὲ τὸ πλάσμα διέλαθεν, ὅλην ἀτενῶς ὁρῶντα τὴν κόρην, ὅλην εἰκονίζοντα κατὰ νοῦν καὶ ὅλην ἀναπλαττόμενον· ἐμὲ δ' ἐξεπύρωσε τὸ κηρύκειον καὶ διψητικώτατον ἔθετο) 'κάμοι παράσχου τὸ ἔκπωμα.' 4 'Ὁ δ' ἄλλα (τί γὰρ ἄλλο ποιεῖν ἐμελλε;) παρτίθετο, καὶ νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα τὴν παρθένον ἐδόκουν πίνειν αὐτήν· τὰ χεῖλη ταύτης κατεφίλουσαν ἔρωτικῶς καὶ φιλῶν ὑπέκλεπτον τὰ φιλήματα· ὑπηρέτην εἶχον τὸ ἔκπωμα τῆς ἐμῆς φίλσης Ἵσμινης τὰ χεῖλη μετακομίζον μοι. 5 Ἐξερρόφουν τοῦ πόματος καὶ νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς τοιοῦτον εἰς αὐτὴν κατέρρει μου τὴν ψυχὴν, οἷον ἐν ὀνείροις ἀπὸ μασ-

<sup>103</sup> The pieces of scene are longer in *H&H* 8.12–14, when Hysminias has settled down.

<sup>104</sup> Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) 20.

<sup>105</sup> See Cohn (1978) 143–265, esp. 153–159 and 161–165.



τῶν ἐξερρόφησα· καὶ περιεργότερον ὅλον ἔβλεπον τὸ ποτήριον, μή τι τοῦ χείλους τῆς κόρης τῷ χεῖλει τοῦ ποτηρίου κεκόλληται. 6 Ἡ δ' ὁρώσαί μου καὶ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὸ βλέμμα καὶ τὴν μεθ' ἡδονῆς τοῦ πόματος ἀναρρόφησιν ἐρωτικῶς ἐμειδία καὶ Χάριτας ὅλας ὡς ἐν κατόπτροις ὑπεζωγράφησε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸν ἔρωτα. (H&H 5.11.2–6)

She, in maidenly fashion, took the cup with her fingertips and put it to her lips with maidenly decorum; taking only a small sip from the cup she handed it back completely, maidenly modesty playing its part in the game. 3 And I said to Kratisthenes (for the game had not passed me by as I watched the girl intently, picturing her entirely in my mind and imagining her, for the herald's wand had seared me and left me parched), 'Offer me the cup too.' 4 So—what else could he do—he offered it and, by Eros, I seemed to be drinking down the girl herself. I kissed her lips passionately and, as I kissed, I stole the kisses. For the cup was my assistant who conveyed my beloved Hysmine's lips to me. 5 I sipped from the cup and, by the gods, there flowed into my soul what I had sipped from her breasts in my dreams. I gazed deep into the cup inquiringly in case a part of the girl's lip had adhered to the lip of the cup. 6 She saw my gesture and glance and my delighted drinking from the cup, and smiled passionately and depicted in her eyes, as if in a mirror, all the graces and Eros himself.

The scene is so descriptive that it borders upon a *tableau*, a detailed picture of a piece of action.<sup>106</sup> It does, however, entail time and action, and should thus be seen as part of the narrative. The scene described is to a large extent inner scene: the feelings that the narrator experiences while he and the heroine play. Scene in H&H often displays this tendency, and in that respect sometimes borders upon commentary.<sup>107</sup>

Summary may be very detailed and close to scene. We will look at one example of summary as well. The passage occurs after a discussion on the painting of the twelve months.

Οὕτω τοίνυν καταφιλοσοφήσαντες τὴν γραφὴν περὶ τὸ δωμάτιον ἀνεχορῶμεν· ὕπνου γὰρ ἐκάλει καιρός. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Κρατισθένης περὶ τὴν κλίνην ἐγένετο, ἐγὼ δ' ἐνεκαρτέρουν τῷ κήπῳ, τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἐθέλων ἰδεῖν, καὶ ὅλους πρὸς τὴν πύλην εἶχον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς· 2 νοῦς γὰρ ἔρωτι τρωθεὶς ὅλον καθ' αὐτὸν ἀναπλάττει τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μετὰγει περὶ τὸ πλάσμα καὶ ὅλον ὁρᾶν δοκεῖ τὸ πλαττόμενον· οὕτω πῦρ ἔρωτος πεσὼν εἰς ψυχὴν καὶ τὰς φύσεις αὐτὰς μεταπλάττει καὶ μεθαρμόζεται. Καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης τῆς κλίνης ἀναστὰς μεθείλκε με περὶ τὸ δωμάτιον 'νῦξ δ' ἤδη τελέθει' λέγων, 'ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι.' (H&H 4.19)

<sup>106</sup> On *tableaux* with references, see Hägg (1971a) 93; cf. Chatman (1990) 32. It is virtually impossible to distinguish *tableau* from *ekphrasis*, for example the opening scene in Heliodoros, *Aith.* 1.1. Cf. Palm (1965/66) 183–190, 194–202 on *ekphrasis* in the novel and the difference between Heliodoros and Tatius.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. below, pp. 87–89.

Having thus discussed the painting, we made our way back to our chamber, for the time for sleep summoned us. Kratisthenes lay on the couch, but I lingered in the garden, wishing to see Hysmine, and kept my eyes completely on the doorway. 2 For the mind that has been wounded by love constantly creates in itself the beloved object and transfers the eyes to the figure, and seems always to visualize what it has invented; such is the effect of the fire of love when it attacks the soul and transforms and reconfigures its nature. Kratisthenes got up from the couch and led me to the chamber, saying, 'night-time advances apace: 'tis good to pay heed to the night-time.'

The form of narrative here is summary telling us quite briefly what happened, but it is provided with additional information: we went to the bedroom—because it was time to sleep; I stayed in the garden—because I wanted to see Hysmine. There is also a piece of commentary inserted in 4.19.2 (νοῦς γὰρ ἔρωτι τρωθεὶς κτλ.), and the passage closes with scene in the form of speech, a transition to scene in the following passage.<sup>108</sup> Summary is here made detailed by means of inserted commentary; it may be compared to the passages 2.6.2–7 (the discussion of the painting of the Virtues) and 4.18 (the discussion of the painting of the twelve months). Detailed as these are, they are expressed in summary form and not as scene—they do not quote, but only report, the discussions of the young men.

Summary often functions as recapitulation, repeating previous scene. This is of course in line with the novel's repetitive scheme that we have described earlier. There are many examples (e.g. *H&H* 2.14.2–3; 5.5.1–2; 6.12) and one should note the fullness of detail in these passages; they are indeed close to scene. The tendency is particularly conspicuous in book 9, in which Hysminias "relives" his previous experiences through his herald master. Scene functions as recapitulation only when the past is retold in direct speech (e.g. 8.13; 9.13).

Events of a story may also be omitted from a narrative. In Genette's terms, this is called *ellipsis*, which refers to the part of the text in which "a non-existent section of narrative corresponds to some duration of story."<sup>109</sup> Ellipsis occurs in *H&H* in connection with journeys. It may be explicitly announced by the narrator, as in 1.3.1: ἤκω τοίνυν ἐπ' αὐτήν· τί γὰρ δεῖ τὰν μέσῳ φιλοσοφεῖν; "and so I came there. Why should I dwell at length on what had taken place in the meantime?"<sup>110</sup> It may also be carried out

<sup>108</sup> For a similar example, see e.g. *H&H* 2.13, where descriptive detail is inserted and the passage closes with scene in the form of speech.

<sup>109</sup> Genette (1980) 93.

<sup>110</sup> See also *H&H* 5.7.2 and 10.5.2.



silently, as in 11.17.2: ἀπαίρομεν ἐκ Δαφνηπόλεως εἰς Ἀρτύκωμιν, “we left Daphnepolis to go to Artykomis.”<sup>111</sup> The other extreme, i.e. when “some section of narrative discourse corresponds to a non-existent diegetic duration”, is by Genette called *descriptive pause*.<sup>112</sup> This is, however, a term that we will not use, since description will here be treated as a separate text-type.

#### DESCRIPTION

Description here designates “pure” descriptive discourse: a pause in the fictional time-flow with no internal temporal movement. This should be distinguished from narrative filled with descriptive detail, which does not constitute description as a text-type. The fundamental difference between descriptive scene and description as a text-type is that scene is *temporal* (being part of the narrative), while description is *spatial*. Chatman defends the notion of description as a text-type in its own right by arguing that description does not “fuse” with narrative at the level of the underlying structure, but only at that of sentences.<sup>113</sup> Instead, one text-type comes in to assist the other in a reciprocal textual service. Description can thus coexist with narrative without calling too much attention to itself, particularly when it is blended into the action. A problem in this respect is dreaming.

Dreaming, which covers a large part of *H&H* books 3–5, is temporal and advances the action—as Hysminias is dreaming fictional time goes on. At the same time it also reports inner mental processes, and dreaming would in this respect be considered as scene—the narrator is indeed showing us what he sees. When the dreams are retold after the dreamer-narrator has woken up, they would accordingly be expressed as summary. Dreams do not exist on the same level as the ordinary fictional action, but they mark a deviation from the main story line. I therefore think that they should be classified as description: they replace, even if temporarily, one narrative flow with an-

<sup>111</sup> See also *H&H* 11.18.2.

<sup>112</sup> Genette (1980) 93–4. According to Genette, scene and summary are the intermediaries of descriptive pause and *ellipsis*: scene “realizes conventionally the equality of time between narrative and story”, while summary “covers the entire range included between scene and ellipsis”, so that in scene, narrative time = story time (fictional time) and in summary, narrative time < story time.

<sup>113</sup> Chatman (1990) 31. The status of description has changed dramatically over the last twenty years or so, and there are now a number of important studies on the theory of description; see e.g. Hamon (1980, 1981), Beaujour (1980), and Riffaterre (1980b). See also Bal (1991) 109–145 on description as narration and Gelley (1979) on the relation of description to the represented world.

other.<sup>114</sup> Dreams are then an excellent example of how description may mix with narrative without disturbing the narrative flow.

There are two short descriptions in *H&H* that are interesting in this connection, since although being regular ekphraseis they do not call much attention to themselves as descriptive passages, i.e. they do not disturb the narrative flow. The first description forms the novel's opening passage: the description of Eurykomis in 1.1. A description may traditionally be placed at the very beginning of a narrative text, in order to function as a starting-point for the story; the narrator moves straight on to the action once he has described the setting.<sup>115</sup> The second short description is that of Hysmine's face in 3.6. It is inserted into a dream-sequence, and blends naturally into the surrounding description. These examples also illustrate the difficulties involved in drawing a distinct line between different text-types: they do not simply succeed, but overlap each other to form a sometimes very complicated pattern.

The extensive ekphraseis, on the other hand, do call attention to themselves.<sup>116</sup> We will not discuss the subjects of the descriptions here, but study how the ekphraseis interact with other text-types. They are all placed in the first part of the novel (*H&H* 1.4–6; 2.2–9; 4.5–16). The latter two display a close interaction between description and narrative, showing the following pattern: a person beholds an object, describes it in detail, discusses its appearance and purpose, and finally interprets its meaning, i.e. beholding – describing – interpreting.<sup>117</sup> The paintings are also accompanied

<sup>114</sup> Cf. below, p. 142.

<sup>115</sup> Chatman (1990) 15–16. See also below, pp. 178–180 on the opening descriptions of Tattius and Longus. For a Byzantine example, see Michael Italikos' *Lament on the Death of his Partridge*, in Gautier (1972) 102–104, which opens with a general description (of different kinds of partridges), followed by a specific description (of his own bird).

<sup>116</sup> On the ekphrasis and its development, see e.g. Downey (1959); Hohlweg (1971); Hunger (1978) I, 170–188; Maguire (1981b); Cizek (1994) 286–294. On the ekphrasis in Byzantium, see also Mitsi & Agapitos (1990/91) and James & Webb (1991). For studies of the ekphrasis from a more modern perspective, see Heffernan (1991, 1993) and Becker (1995).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. the *Imagines* of the Philostrati and those of Kallistratos; on the Philostrati, see above p. 20, n. 52. "Philostratus the Elder" describes and explains paintings in the presence of some young men (*Imag.* 1, proem. 4–5); "the Younger" employs no frame-story, but cf. his *Imag.* proem. 7: "but in order that our book may not proceed on one foot, let it be assumed that there is a person present to whom the details are to be described, that thus the discussion itself may have its proper form." Kallistratos describes no listener, but marks the act of beholding and reacting, e.g. *Imag.* 1.5: "when we saw this..."; 2.4: "indeed you might say that..."; 3.5: "as I gazed on this work of art, the belief came over me...". Trans. by Fairbanks (1931).



by inscriptions that explain their subject. The first ekphrasis does not follow the same textual pattern, as it is not followed by any exegesis. It has, however, exegetic commentary inserted:

Ταῦτ' ἰδὼν τὸν Ἀλκινόου κῆπον ἐδόκουν ὀράν, καὶ μῦθον οὐκ εἶχον τὸ τοῖς ποιηταῖς σεμνολογούμενον πεδίου Ἑλύσιον· [...] Ἐγὼ δ' εἶπον ἰδὼν 'χρυσέαν ἐπλέξω μοι τὴν σειράν, Σώσθηνες.' (*H&H* 1.4.3–4)

Seeing this, I thought I beheld Alcinous' garden and felt that I could not take as fiction the Elysian plain so solemnly described by the poets. [...] When I saw this I said, 'Sosthenes, you have woven me a golden chain.'

The Homeric allusions,<sup>118</sup> along with the elaborate description itself, emphasise the garden's importance in the novel.<sup>119</sup> They also hint at its function, which is gradually revealed during the course of the novel: this is the abode of Eros, where the couple meet, fall in love and marry.

The second ekphrasis (*H&H* 2.2–9) consists of two parts. The first part (2.2–5) describes a painting depicting the four Virtues. It has a short piece of narrative inserted (2.2.3), reporting the reaction of the beholders and thus functioning as commentary. In 2.6 follows narrative telling us that Hysminias and Kratisthenes enquired (ἐφιλοσοφούμεν<sup>120</sup>) about the meaning of the painting. They find an inscription which helps them understand the painting, and their interpretation is rendered in summary form (2.6.2–7). A commentary is inserted in 2.6.6. The second part (2.7–9) describes the next painting: Eros seated on a throne surrounded by a crowd of people and animals. The ekphrasis is broken up by an inserted piece of narrative in 2.7.5–2.8, again functioning as commentary, after which the description continues. The ekphrasis is followed by a discussion (2.10–11), explaining the meaning of the painting. An inscription is found above this picture too (2.10.5).

The same pattern appears in the third ekphrasis, that of the twelve months (*H&H* 4.5–16). The ekphrasis is followed by narrative, telling us that Hysminias and Kratisthenes found an inscription (4.17.2) and then identified each man/month (4.18.2–13); another discussion follows in 4.20.

There is a distinct pattern of beholding-describing-interpreting: a detailed description is followed by a discussion and an interpretation, supported by an inscription.<sup>121</sup> The constitution of each sequence is nearly emblematic, in

<sup>118</sup> See below, pp. 100–101, 211, 263–264.

<sup>119</sup> See above, p. 52, and below, pp. 122–123, 209.

<sup>120</sup> On the word φιλοσοφῶ and its particular meaning here, see below, pp. 183–184.

<sup>121</sup> On the difference between “compact” and “broken” ekphrasis in the Palaiologan romances, see Agapitos (1991) 179, with examples in pp. 180–193.

its combination of picture, inscription and explanation.<sup>122</sup> The ekphrasis sequences show how different text-types operate together: description comes in to serve narrative, to evoke a certain picture to the mind of the reader, but then narrative comes in to serve description, to make sure the reader gets the right interpretation. Sometimes commentary is called in for further assistance.

#### COMMENTARY

Commentary consists, like description, of material detached from fictional time, presented in the narrating act. In Chatman's definition, commentary (or "argument", as he terms it) comprises the narrator's commentaries on actions or characters either on the lips or in the mind of a character.<sup>123</sup> This is a broad definition that needs some distinctions. It may be argued that all commentary should be considered *authorial commentary*, since the author is responsible for all interferences with his text,<sup>124</sup> but there is definitely a difference between comments on the part of the characters and comments on the part of the narrator. I would like to separate commentary from authorial commentary, so that "commentary" here refers to any kind of commentary made by characters including the hero-narrator (e.g. the interpretations of Hysminias and Kratisthenes in *H&H* 2.2.3 or 2.7.5–2.8), and "authorial commentary" indicates only the comments made by the narrator, such as the ellipsis in *H&H* 1.3.1 discussed above.<sup>125</sup>

A further distinction should be made between commentary expressed in the characters' "own words" and that expressed in quotations, allusions, maxims, and sayings. For the Byzantines there was a major difference be-

<sup>122</sup> I use "emblematic" here in its restricted technical sense, deriving from the emblem-books of the Renaissance, starting with Alciatus' *Emblemata*, published in 1531. The emblem is an allegorical or symbolic expression, said to originate from Egyptian hieroglyphs and Pythagorean thought; Alciatus is also said to have been inspired by Greek epigrams, through his translation of the *Greek Anthology*. A complete emblem consists of three parts: *inscriptio*, *pictura* and *subscriptio*, of which none can be removed without detriment to the emblem's full meaning; see e.g. Daly (1979) 3–36. This is, of course, a genre that occurs much later than the novel, but it may still be interesting to note the similarities in representation.

<sup>123</sup> Chatman (1990) 14. Cf. Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) 19, who sees commentary as "every recognizably personal touch, every distinctive literary allusion or colorful metaphor, every pattern of myth or symbol".

<sup>124</sup> Cf. e.g. Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) 19: "any discerning reader can recognize that they are imported by the author."

<sup>125</sup> See above, p. 83.



tween personal comment and quoted comment, which implied ancient models and authority.<sup>126</sup>

Commentary may vary in dependence, from loosely inserted commentaries of any kind to explanations subserving narrative. They may also vary in length, from very short comments such as οὕτω γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν φίλον ὀρίζομαι, “for so I define a friend” (*H&H* 1.7.2), to longer passages,

ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἔκπωμα μάλα τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πόμα γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ διειδὲς καὶ μάλα ψυχρόν, ὥν οὐτι γένοιτ’ ἂν ἡδύτερον ἀνδρὶ διψῶντι καὶ καυματουμένῳ καὶ ζέοντι (*H&H* 1.8.4)

because the cup was very delightful and the wine very sweet and the water clear and cold, than which nothing can be more agreeable for a man who is thirsty and very hot and sweaty.

The function of commentary is, as in the two examples above, to evaluate, or to explain the narrative itself, for example in *H&H* 1.8.3: οὐκ ἔπειθε γὰρ μ’ αὐτοῦ προπιεῖν, “for he could not persuade me to drink before him.” Commentary may also function didactically; in such cases it is often expressed in borrowed words in order to emphasise its authoritative nature. An example is the statement of Kratisthenes already quoted above: “night-time advances apace: ’tis good to pay heed to the night-time” (4.19.2).<sup>127</sup> Borrowed words do not necessarily fall back upon ancient literature, but may be proverbial sayings or maxims, such as τροφή γὰρ καὶ πόσις καὶ κόπος ὕπνου πηγὴ, “for food and drink and hard work are the sources of sleep” (1.13.2). The authority implied is then different: not that of the influential ancient author, but that of common knowledge: “as we all know...”<sup>128</sup>

Commentary is the discourse in which the narrator communicates with his audience, more or less explicitly. Since *H&H* is narrated in the first person, the narrator and the leading character are the same person, and both commentary and authorial commentary are in most cases represented as Hysminias’ words or thoughts. Even in the last part of the epilogue (*H&H* 11.23), in which the author steps out of his character, it is through the mouth of Hysminias that the narrator speaks to us: ἡμεῖς δὲ καταχαριτῶσομεν κτλ, “we will adorn etc.” (i.e. “I and Hysmine”), and then in the very last sentence καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ, “and me, Hysminias” (11.23.3).<sup>129</sup>

<sup>126</sup> See further below, 3.2.

<sup>127</sup> See above, pp. 82–83.

<sup>128</sup> See further below, chapter 3.2.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. the last sentence of *H&H* in the Barroccianus, where there is no narrative “me”; see above, p. 76, n. 81.

Hysminias often speaks as if directly to the reader, in phrases like εἴποις ἰδὼν ποταμὸν ἐριβρύχην καὶ πολύρρουν περιρρεῖν με τὸν κήρυκα, “if you had been watching you would have said that a raging flood of river-water was pouring over me, the herald” (*H&H* 1.2.2). This kind of commentary concerns the vivacity of things described, and it is often expressed in similes or analogies, in order to emphasise the liveliness of a narrative or of an ekphrasis.<sup>130</sup>

I have already mentioned the addressee Charidoux, to whom the narrator turns in *H&H* 1.2.2: κάλλιστέ μοι Χαρίδουξ, “my dear Charidoux”.<sup>131</sup> The name is never repeated, but the addressee in the following chapter, ὡγαθέ, “my good friend” (1.3.1), is probably the same person.<sup>132</sup> Charidoux seems to be addressed one more time before the addressee is dropped, σύ δ’ ἂν εἰ δικαστῆς καθίσσης αὐτῶν, οὐκ οἶδ’ ὧς τὴν νικῶσαν ἀποχαρίσῃ, “If you had to sit in judgement on them, I do not know on which you would bestow the prize” (1.4.2).<sup>133</sup> It may, however, be argued that this reference, along with any “you” in the remaining part of the novel, may be seen as a presumptive reader or listener, and that no distinction needs to be made between different persons addressed by Hysminias.

I have mentioned that commentary can be used to emphasise the liveliness of an ekphrasis. This is, in fact, a typical ekphrastic element that has been taken over by Makrembolites and inserted into his narrative.<sup>134</sup> The function of such a comment, whether in an ekphrasis or in the novel, is primarily to force the reader to visualise the object described. For example, the comment that Hysminias makes on the garden is an analogy alluding to Homer: “seeing this, I thought I beheld Alcinous’ garden and felt that I could not take as fiction the Elysian plain, so solemnly described by poets” (*H&H* 1.4.3).<sup>135</sup> Here, allusion and analogy have been combined in the commentary, which further underlines the significance of the object described.

<sup>130</sup> On commentary and exclamations, see also below, p. 246.

<sup>131</sup> See above, pp. 52–53.

<sup>132</sup> In some manuscripts the addressee is called Charidemos; on the MSS, see Plepelits (1989) 2, n. 3. Cf. Dunlop (1888) 81, quoted by Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 81: “the author introduces the hero relating his own adventures; but one cannot discover whom he addresses, or why he is discoursing.” This makes me wonder if Dunlop perhaps had read a translation from which the name had been removed; according to Plepelits, the name has been left out also in one of the MSS.

<sup>133</sup> Conca (1994a) 502, n. 2.

<sup>134</sup> For a contemporary example, see e.g. Manasses’ ekphrasis of a mosaic in the imperial palace; text in Lampsidis (1991), and discussed by Mitsi & Agapitos (1991) 116–118. In the ancient novel, see e.g. *L&K* 3.6–8.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. *Od.* 7.112–131. *H&H* 1.4.3 was quoted in Greek above, p. 86.



There is one passage that must be defined as commentary, but which does not mix with other text-types, namely the epilogue.<sup>136</sup> The passage is conspicuous since it falls outside the narrative frame and functions as a commentary on the whole narrative as such; this is also the reason why I have chosen to refer to it as an epilogue.

#### NARRATIVE CHARACTERISTICS

At times it is hard to determine which text-type subserves another in *H&H*—is it the inserted ekphrasis that serves narrative, or does the surrounding narrative actually serve description? Commentary is rather evenly distributed over the novel, mixed with either narrative or description. The three text-types intertwine and interact closely, contributing to the highly reflective and subjective impact of the novel. The epic flow of traditional narrative has in Makrembolites to a high degree been replaced by the use of ekphrasis, ethopoetic monologue and dialogue.<sup>137</sup> Narrative often appears as inner scene, which constitutes emotional stops in the temporal flow. The emphasis lies constantly on feelings and psychology. This is perhaps not what we usually associate with a Byzantine twelfth-century novel.

There was, however, an awakening interest in individual emotions in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, most often illustrated by the works of Prodromos.<sup>138</sup> Indeed the interest in the ancient novel, documented in the essay of Psellos, itself indicates a certain interest in romantic emotion.<sup>139</sup> We must also note the interest in emotional reaction that is displayed by the ethopoeia, and which has been picked up and further explored by Makrembolites.<sup>140</sup> Also the strong position of ekphrasis and its integration into the novel should be taken into account here, since ekphrasis too plays on emo-

<sup>136</sup> *H&H* 11.20–23; quoted above, pp. 75–76.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Agapitos (1991) 141–143, on the three narrative modes of the vernacular romances: narrative, discursive, and descriptive mode; see also id. (1998a) 145, on *H&H* as an attempt at a synthesis of drama, ancient novel and ethopoeia.

<sup>138</sup> Kazhdan & Franklin (1984) 112–114; see also Jeffreys (1980) 479, and Beck (1977) 59–60. Kazhdan and Franklin add that other writers before Prodromos had focused on personality and emotion, but do not specify which authors. We must note that “individual emotion” here should be understood from a rhetorical perspective, i.e. rather as “construction of” personal identity or emotions.

<sup>139</sup> On Psellos’ essay, see above, pp. 23–24, 27. Inclination towards subjective emotion and “realism” in literature is often seen as linked to Christianity; see e.g. Jauss (1968) esp. 143–168, and Auerbach (1974) esp. 554–555.

<sup>140</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 143; cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 22–28 and Agapitos & Smith (1992) 22–25.

tional reaction.<sup>141</sup> The use of rhetorical exercises to depict a “realistic”<sup>142</sup> psychological course of events is no contradiction: rhetorical is not the opposite of realistic, and rhetoric was a tool to depict characters and situations as vividly as possible.<sup>143</sup> The rhetorical exercises appear in the ancient novels too and no external source needs to be found, even if there indeed seems to be a connection with Basilakes’ progymnasmata.<sup>144</sup>

It was noted by Hunger already in the 1960s that elements primarily in the first part of *H&H* recall modern naturalism.<sup>145</sup> Alexiou argued that the effect was achieved by the use of dreams, and that some of the elements that Makrembolites displays in the erotic dreams were explored by twentieth-century novelists trying to penetrate the individual’s psyche.<sup>146</sup> I think that Alexiou, although she did not mention any examples, referred to the works of High Modernism and the lyrical novel, in which the so-called stream-of-consciousness device was widely used; in any case, this is a good example of literature that explores partly the same elements as does Makrembolites.<sup>147</sup> We may note that, although there is no connection between the lyrical and the Byzantine novel, modernist authors were influenced by the episodic romance and allegorical quests such as *Don Quixote*.<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> In *H&H* see e.g. Hysminias’ reaction to the garden of Sosthenes and to the paintings of the Virtues, Eros, and the twelve months.

<sup>142</sup> “Realistic” in quotation marks, because realism is a modern concept and should perhaps not be used in connection with Byzantine fictional narrative; cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 28–29 and the comments of Agapitos & Smith (1992) 24–25. For the term *psychological realism* in a discussion of the Byzantine novel, see Hunger (1980) esp. 17, and cf. id. (1968) 76. On the concept of realism in literary scholarship, see Wellek (1963), Jakobson (1987) 19–27, and Barthes (1982).

<sup>143</sup> Hunger (1980) 17. Hunger also points to the ambivalent use of rhetoric in the Komnenian novels: on the one hand it is used to achieve realistic effect, on the other too much rhetoric may “choke” realism. See also Agapitos (1991) 76 and n. 112 on the use of rhetorical devices for emotional purposes in Byzantine literature, and Dennis (1997b) on rhetoric and reality in imperial panegyric. One may note that realism by modern theorists often is seen as a rhetorical strategy; cf. Auerbach’s, (1974) 3–23, use of the notion of realism in his analysis of Homer and *Genesis*.

<sup>144</sup> Poljakova (1969) argued that Basilakes was the pupil of Makrembolites; the opposite relation was tentatively suggested by Magdalino (1992) 203.

<sup>145</sup> Hunger (1968) 74; id. (1980) 14.

<sup>146</sup> Alexiou (1977) 40–42 and 43: “[...] *Hysmine and Hysminias* is closer to the modern novel than any other Byzantine literature I have read.”

<sup>147</sup> On the form of the lyrical novel, see Freedman (1963); see also Frank (1991) on the concept of spatial form.

<sup>148</sup> Freedman (1963) 14. Cervantes, in his turn, was in his last work, *Persiles y Sigismunda*, greatly inspired by Heliodoros; see e.g. Billault (1992).



Alexiou suggested that the erotic dreams in *H&H* may have been influenced by Provençal court poetry.<sup>149</sup> However, she thought it more probable that Makrembolites had adapted erotic material from the ancient novel, perhaps drawing also upon the temptation dreams in saints' lives.<sup>150</sup> I think that the ancient novel as a source of material for the Komnenian novels has been treated very ambivalently: on the one hand, the Byzantine novels are considered "copies" of the ancient "models", but on the other we try to find different sources for the erotic elements in the twelfth century texts. There is, however, not yet any clear evidence for influence from the West, whereas the interest in Eros and his powers in twelfth-century Byzantium is well documented.<sup>151</sup> Even if the majority of surviving texts in question, e.g. the progymnasmata of Basilakes and the poems of Manganeios Prodromos, are placed in the middle of the century, a literary trend can hardly ever be pinpointed to a specific decade, and the dating of Makrembolites to the 1130s or 1140s should therefore not entail any problems in this respect. And again, we do have at hand a documented reading of and interest in the ancient novels in the eleventh century, and that genre seems to include the elements needed by the Byzantine novelists.<sup>152</sup>

#### THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF THE NOVEL

It has been argued that *H&H* falls into two or three parts,<sup>153</sup> and I myself have talked about different "parts" of the novel, in this chapter suggesting a tripartition (books 1–6; 7–9; 10–11).<sup>154</sup> Any division depends on the criteria it is based on—the text-types, the action, the (fictional) geographical movement, or the temporal aspects of the narrative—and will thus always be somewhat artificial. As long as we are aware of that fact it is, however, convenient to look at the different parts of a narrative. We will take a look at the division used in this section, which was based on the tempo, and add some other criteria.

<sup>149</sup> Alexiou (1977) 42; cf. Cupane (1974).

<sup>150</sup> Alexiou (1977) 42. Cf. below, p. 196 and n. 151.

<sup>151</sup> On the question of Western influence and the resultant dating of the novels, see above, pp. 16–17.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. above, pp. 25–34, and chapters 1.2.4 and 2.2.4 below.

<sup>153</sup> Alexiou (1977) 30, distinguishes two parts in the novel (1–5, 6–11); cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 82–83, who argues that the novel "falls naturally into three distinct parts" (1–5, 6–8, 9–11).

<sup>154</sup> See above, p. 80.

*Part 1, books 1–6.* Falling-in-love phase. The tempo is slow. Description is the dominating text-type. Geographical movement: Eurykomis – Aulikomis – Eurykomis. Time: 6 days.

*Part 2, books 7–9.* Adventure phase. Hysminias becomes a slave who travels with his master herald to another city (= repetition of the first part of story). The tempo is faster. Description as text-type is absent. Geographical movement: Eurykomis – Artykomis – Daphnepolis – Artykomis. Time: 3 days and ellipsis of 1 or 2 days, 1 day and ellipsis of ca. 1 year.

*Part 3, books 10–11.* Reunion phase. The reunited couple travel back with the herald master to his hometown (= continued repetition of part 1). The tempo slows down. Description as text-type is still absent, but narrative scene becomes more frequent. Geographical movement: Daphnepolis – Artykomis – Aulikomis. Time: 7 days.

As we can see, the different criteria make one overall division quite impossible. Story-wise, the first part of the story is repeated in the second part of the novel, which makes a threefold division pointless.<sup>155</sup> But if we look at temporal aspects, the tripartite division based on narrative tempo is necessary. When we take narrative space and geographical movement into account, a different division is, however, required.<sup>156</sup>

In any case the author did not divide his book into “parts”, but into “books”. *H&H*, as we have already seen, consists of 11 books. There are no strong reasons to suspect that this division was not made by the author himself. Firstly, a book never begins or ends abruptly.<sup>157</sup> Secondly, the division into books was probably part of the imitation of the ancient novels, which all were divided into books of varying length. The ancient authors were forced to divide their works into books or chapters because of the scrolls they were using: the length of one scroll was limited, and for any longer work they needed more than one.<sup>158</sup> This was a limitation that did not affect the Byzantine authors. Accordingly, a scribe who copied a twelfth-century manuscript had no reason to divide a work into books unless it was part of the original. Furthermore, a number of manuscripts of *H&H* give a

<sup>155</sup> See above, pp. 56–63. Cf. Alexiou (1977) 30: “the movement is cyclical: in the first five books we go from Eurykomis to Aulikomis and return to Eurykomis. In the second part, which repeats the main episodes of the first part, the geographical setting is wider, balancing the greater density of action.”

<sup>156</sup> See below, p. 141.

<sup>157</sup> See e.g. below, pp. 94–95 on sleep as time marker.

<sup>158</sup> For a discussion of problems related to this issue, see Hägg (1966).



title including the number of books.<sup>159</sup> Even if this may be a later addition to the original title, it probably reflects an internal division of the work.<sup>160</sup>

Book division, even if the books do not have sub-titles, may be called a paratextual device.<sup>161</sup> Paratextual devices are not the only markers of episodes in a narrative text, although the most apparent ones. The author may also include *infratextual* openings and closures: the articulation of narrative into units such as sections or chapters.<sup>162</sup> These may or may not coincide with the paratextual devices, the formal openings and closings of books. Mentionings of sleep in *H&H* are most often used as time markers, and indeed any reader of the novel notices that there is a lot of talk about sleeping.<sup>163</sup> Most of the time markers relate to evening and night-time activities, and the vast majority to falling asleep, sleeping and waking up.

Apart from being a time marker, sleep may also open and close episodes. For example, in *H&H* 3.2.1 a discussion between Kratisthenes and Hysminias is opened by Hysminias waking up from a dream, *συναπέπτη δέ μου καὶ ὕπνος εὐθύς*, “and immediately sleep flew away from me.” The discussion is then closed by Kratisthenes falling asleep, *καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης εὐθὺς ὑπνώττων ἀνέρεγχευ*, “so Kratisthenes promptly dropped off to sleep again and began to snore” (3.4.1); the same structure may be seen in 1.13.1–1.14.5. In book 7 Hysminias’ falling asleep aboard the ship closes the elopement episode,<sup>164</sup> whereas his waking up the next morning opens the dramatic passage on the storm and sacrifice (7.8.1). In contrast, Hysminias’ feigned sleep in 4.4.1, *περὶ τὴν κλίνην γενόμενος ὑπεκρινόμεν ὑπνοῦν*, “when I reached the couch I feigned sleep,” does not mark any beginning or end of passage. Also, falling asleep opens dream episodes, just as awakening

<sup>159</sup> *λόγοι* *ια'* or *βιβλία περιέχον ια'*; see Hilberg (1876) xlix.

<sup>160</sup> In a remarkable number of the early MSS the first pages are missing, either torn or otherwise damaged. In two of the four 13th-century MSS the first folio is damaged: Vat. Barb. gr. 29, on which Hilberg (1876) xlix and Cataldi-Palau (1980) 86–87, and Baroc. 131, on which *ibid.* 78. It is thus not possible to know what the titles looked like, but in Barb. gr. 29, a title including the number of books has been added in a later hand; see Hilberg, *ibid.* viii. The other two 12th-century MSS, Vat. gr. 114 and Vat. gr. 1390, do not include the number of books in the title. It may be added that the second part of Vat. gr. 1390, including Makrembolites and Heliodoros, actually dates from the 14th century; see Cataldi-Palau (1980), 109–110. On the damaged 14th-century MSS, see *ibid.* 101, and n. 1. Cataldi-Palau states that she has counted 16 different titles in the MSS that she has investigated, and that the titles tend to grow longer for each century; *ibid.* 107, n. 2.

<sup>161</sup> For the term and its origin, see above, p. 78 and n. 92.

<sup>162</sup> For the term, see Fusillo (1997) 211 and n. 8.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 560–561: “Schlafen und immer schlafen ist stets die ultima ratio dieses verliebten Marmeltiers.” See also below, p. 129 on time markers.

<sup>164</sup> *H&H* 7.7.2; quoted below, p. 214.

closes them. This is, of course, a “natural” framing of dreaming, but here it is artificially constructed. In order to dream, one must indeed first fall asleep; it is, however, not necessary for the narrator to prepare the reader for a dream sequence by reporting the falling asleep. Still, this is what the narrator Hysminias does every single time.

In remarkably many cases Hysminias’ awakening and falling asleep coincide with openings and closings of books. Books 1–2 and 4–5 close with the narrator falling asleep; books 6 and 7 close with dreams and the hero waking up. Books 6–8 open with the hero waking up; books 3 and 5 open as a dream begins. Book 8 is the only book in which Hysminias’ own sleep is not mentioned. In book 9, Hysminias suffers from insomnia (*H&H* 9.6.4; 9.11.3) until he is sure about Hysmine’s identity and love, and then he falls asleep and dreams (10.4). Even though book 10 closes with implied sleep, *καὶ οὕτως ἡμεῖς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων γενόμενοι τὴν νύκτα παρεμετρήσαμεν*, “and so, separated from each other, we passed the night,” and book 11 opens with implied awakening, *τῇ δ’ ὑστεραίᾳ*, “on the following day...”), there are no explicit markers. In book 11, sleep follows the dinner in the usual manner, *τέλος τὸ δεῖπνον ἐδέχετο, καὶ τοῖς ὕπνοις ὡς ἐκ πολυτελοῦς τραπέζης εὐθὺς ἐσπείσαμεθα*, “the meal came to its end, and we immediately made the libation to sleep that follows a luxurious banquet” (11.17.1). The report of this night is, however, elliptical and functions only as a time marker, since the morning follows immediately, *ἐπεὶ δὲ νύξ οὐδαμοῦ (ἥλιος γὰρ ὑπὲρ γῆν) καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς ὕπνοις ἀπεσπείσαμεθα, τῆς στρωμνῆς ἀνέστησεν ἕκαστος*, “when night was nowhere to be seen (for the sun was over the earth) and we had completed our libations to sleep, each of us rose from their beds.” (11.17.1). The “natural” order that sleep follows dinners, eating and drinking is explicitly explained in 1.13.2: *οἱ δ’ οὐκ ἀπεσπῶντό μου τῶν βλεφάρων· τροφή γὰρ καὶ πόσις καὶ κόπος ὕπνου πηγῇ*, “but sleep would not let itself from my eyes for food and drink and hard work are the sources of sleep.” Accordingly, it is only in books 1–7 that sleep is strongly emphasised; the falling asleep, dreaming and awakening in 7.18–19 mark the end of this first part of the novel.

The coinciding of sleep with book endings has epic models. Several of the songs in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* end with gods or people falling asleep, for example in the first song of the *Iliad*, which ends with the sleep of Zeus. In *Iliad* 7, the Trojans and the Greeks fall asleep after feasting.<sup>165</sup> Also the

<sup>165</sup> Cf. also the closures of *Il.* 9; *Od.* 14, 16 and 19. On night as poetic closure in Greco-Roman and later literature, see Curtius (1953) 89–91.



opening of songs with the break of dawn is a standard device in Homer, used in the ancient novels primarily by Heliodoros in his opening scene.<sup>166</sup>

The reader is reminded of the Homeric model also in comments upon sleep, for example in the modified quotation from the *Iliad* 2.24, οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὔδειν ἄνδρα κήρυκα, “a herald should not sleep all night long.” (*H&H* 1.13.1). The allusion is even more explicit in 3.4.7: Hysminias lies sleepless thinking about his beloved, and he says to himself: ἂν τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νυκτὶ ζητήσῃ, συγκοιμηθήσομαι τῇ παρθένῳ, καὶ νήδυμον τὸν ὕπνον ἀνακηρύξω ποιητικῶς, “if she is looking for what is appropriate for the night, I will go and sleep with the maiden and I will proclaim in poetic manner that sleep is sweet.” We have already discussed the sexual connotations of the passage, and seen how τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νυκτὶ, “what is appropriate for the night” refers back to Sosthenes’ Homeric quotation in *H&H* 2.13.3 and Hysmine’s advice to obey her father in *H&H* 2.14.1.<sup>167</sup> The solemn comment of Sosthenes is twisted into an erotic pun, but similarly Hysminias’ poetic, i.e. Homeric, proclamation reflects Sosthenes’ statement in *H&H* 2.13.3. Commentary on the nature of sleep thus also underlines its structural function.

My aim in chapters 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 has been to present the compositional and structural aspects of *H&H* as seen from different angles: on internal and external levels and also from a strictly textual point of view. I will now move on to motifs and themes, which are related to other structural aspects of the plot.

#### 1.2.4 Motifs and themes

The use of the term *theme* is often imprecise, and it has even been argued that it is too vague to be truly useful: the term does not really distinguish between dominant content, central subject, unified “thought” or authorial intention.<sup>168</sup> Modern theory suggests a new definition in terms of a work’s semantics: theme should be seen as the meeting place of a literary work’s semantic levels with formal structural qualities such as rhythm and repeti-

<sup>166</sup> See e.g. the openings of *Il.* 8, 11, 19; *Od.* 2, 3, 5, 8, 16 and 17.

<sup>167</sup> See above, pp. 71–72.

<sup>168</sup> Brown (1993) 643; cf. Daemmrich & Daemmrich (1987) 239–241. For an ambivalent use of the term in connection with the Byzantine novel, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 54–67 on “thematic elements” (the past, love as a tyrant, love and death, chance and the passive hero, art and nature), sometimes referred to as “themes”, e.g. p. 82: “a further element must now be added, and that is the theme of time and its relation to art.”

tion.<sup>169</sup> In this study, theme is defined as a brief statement that is a literary work's chief concern. The abstract theme of the text is embodied in concrete motifs.<sup>170</sup>

Motifs are, so to speak, the building stones of the plot. The author creates his intrigue by putting together a chain of different motifs; we can thus refer to them as plot elements. Motifs are often connected to the genre; in a crime story, for example, a number of specific motifs are conventional and expected.<sup>171</sup> Of course, not all the motifs in a text are determined by the genre. I have already used the term "novelistic constants", which denotes motifs that are strictly tied to the ancient novel genre. These motifs can, owing to the particular mimetic relation, be expected to appear also in the Byzantine novel, e.g. the garden, the elopement, the shipwreck and enslavement of the protagonists, the virginity ordeal or the final wedding.<sup>172</sup> Plot elements that are not directly dependent upon the genre, e.g. myths or legends concerning persons or places that do not usually appear in the genre, will be referred to as external elements.

Any motif can be expressed in shorter or longer passages, from one or two lines to several paragraphs. Practically all the motifs in *H&H* are novelistic constants; those that are not are in different ways related to *L&K* and therefore not entirely external. Here we will concentrate on three of the primary motifs: the garden, dreaming and slavery. Other motifs will be considered in 2.2.4, in relation to their model *L&K*. In this chapter we will see how traditional motifs may display external aspects, bringing in elements that are not part of the traditional *topos*.

#### THE GARDEN

The garden ekphrasis, even though it appears in only two of the ancient novels, is unquestionably a novelistic *topos*.<sup>173</sup> The garden motif is traditionally invested with erotic undertones, expressed also in a wording that

<sup>169</sup> Brown (1993) 643; cf. Frye (1963) p. 65: "we can see the whole design in the work as a unity [...] a simultaneous pattern radiating out from a center, not a narrative moving in time. The structure is what we call the theme."

<sup>170</sup> See e.g. Daemmrich & Daemmrich (1987) 187–190, 239–241.

<sup>171</sup> See e.g. Fowler (1982) 54–74 on historical kinds and generic repertoire, and 111–118 on subgenre; see also Cairns (1972) 98–124 on originality in the use of *topoi*.

<sup>172</sup> Hunger (1980) 9, lists 12 motifs that are important in both the ancient and the Byzantine novel. On *topoi* in the ancient novel, see Létoublon (1993).

<sup>173</sup> Ekphraseis of gardens occur in Achilles Tatius and Longus, and also in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*; in the Byzantine novels they seem practically obligatory—Eugenianos' *D&C* contains no less than six gardens or paradise meadows. For a list of gardens in ancient and Byzantine novels, see Littlewood (1979) 110–114.



may display sexual connotations. In the ancient and Byzantine novel it is also explicitly associated with Eros, as a scene for erotic action.<sup>174</sup> The garden is often associated with the heroine: the garden belongs to the house where she lives, it is described in connection with the first meeting between the protagonists, and the formal ekphrasis of the heroine tends to follow that of the garden.<sup>175</sup> In the novel, the enclosed beauty of the garden seems to represent the maiden's chastity and virginity.<sup>176</sup>

In *H&H*, the garden motif is highly elaborated and stretches over long passages, starting with the formal ekphrasis in book 1 (*H&H* 1.4–6). The garden of Sosthenes has already been mentioned earlier as the “true” setting of the novel: this is where the couple fall in love, meet and finally marry.<sup>177</sup> The first part of the garden ekphrasis (1.4) describes the garden itself, its flowers, plants and trees. The second part (1.5) describes a fountain, a complicated work of art described in a likewise complicated style. The third and last part (1.6) describes benches arranged around the fountain, completing the picture of the garden as a whole. Hysminias then expresses his amazement: ταῦτα δὴ ταῦτα μὰ Διὶ ὁρώων ὅλην τὴν ὄψιν ἀπεδίδουν τοῖς θεάμασι καὶ μικροῦ δελν ἄφωνος εἰστήκειν, “when, by Zeus, I saw all this, I fastened my entire gaze on the spectacle, and stood all but speechless” (1.7.1). The last piece of information on the garden is not given until a little later:

Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν κήπον ὅσα καὶ οἶα· τὸ δὲ γε θριγγίον, ἄλλο τεράστιον, τοσοῦτον εἰς ὕψος αἰρόμενον ὅσον ἀνέπιβατα τὰν τῷ κήπῳ τηρεῖν καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ ποσὶ, πάντοθεν κατεχαριτοῦτο χειρὶ ζωγράφου σοφῆ. (*H&H* 2.1.2)

So much for the garden. The surrounding wall was another marvel; of sufficient height to prevent inspection of the garden by eyes and feet it was graced everywhere by the hand of a skilled painter.

The descriptions of the paintings follow in 2.2–9 (the Virtues and Eros) and 4.5–16 (the twelve months).

<sup>174</sup> Littlewood (1979) 96–98; on sexuality and the Byzantine garden, see Barber (1992). On gardens in Byzantine literature, see also Schissel (1942); on imperial gardens, see Littlewood (1997) with references to gardens in literature in pp. 15–16, and Maguire (1990, 1994).

<sup>175</sup> Littlewood (1979) 98; Barber (1992) 15.

<sup>176</sup> Littlewood (1979) 107, points to the evidence for a relationship between the woman and the garden, but notes that “in the earlier works it was probably an instinctive and unconscious association.” Cf. Barber (1992) esp. 16, who sees the heroine as the garden.

<sup>177</sup> See above, p. 52.

All three dinners in Aulikomis take place in Sosthenes' garden (*H&H* 1.7–11; 2.12–13; 3.10–4.2). Also Hysminias' meetings with Kratisthenes and Hysmine take place there (2.1–11; 3.8–9; 4.3; 4.4.3–4.20; 4.21–23), and the departure from Aulikomis takes Hysminias through the garden one last time (5.6.2–4). On the whole, practically all the action in books 1–5 takes place in the garden.

The first part of the description, that of the actual garden, contains slight suggestions of sensuality (*H&H* 1.4.1–3), and six of the seven plants mentioned are among the nine erotic plants that are described with erotic tales in the tenth-century so-called *Geoponica*.<sup>178</sup> Wine is served at the dinners, wine which is a product of one of the erotic plants, and with an effect on lovers that is noted for example in the contemporary novel of Manasses.<sup>179</sup>

Hysmine is connected with the garden both explicitly and in interlocking wording or imagery. Hysminias describes her whisper with words recalling his description of the garden: καὶ ἦν τὸ ψιθύρισμα μεστὸν ἡδονῆς, “and the whisper was full of pleasure” (*H&H* 4.1.3), as in 1.4.1, ὁ δὲ μεστὸς ἦν χαρίτων καὶ ἡδονῆς, “this [sc. garden] was full of graces and pleasure.” He also becomes speechless at the first meeting with Hysmine (1.8.4), as at the first sight of the garden (1.7.1). Hysmine describes herself as a garden: Ὑσμινία, σὺ τὴν ἐμὴν ταύτην Ὑσμίνην ἐρωτικῶς κατεκῆπενσας· σὺ μοι καὶ φραγμὸν περίθου τῷ κήπῳ, μὴ χεὶρ ὁδοιποροῦντος τρυγήσῃ με, “Hysminias, you cultivated with passion like a garden this girl you call ‘your Hysmine’; set a barrier around the garden lest a hand of some passerby should pluck me” (*H&H* 6.8.3). Hysmine is also described in rose imagery and as a rose garden, which will be discussed below.<sup>180</sup> The vegetal imagery of the human body was known to the Byzantines from the *Song of Songs*, through which it gained importance in the Marian imagery. In the *chairetismoi* of the *Akathistos* hymn, for example, Mary is described as a beautiful tree and an eternal branch.<sup>181</sup> From the *Song of Songs* derives also the image of the female protagonist as an enclosed garden, κήπος κεκ-

<sup>178</sup> Littlewood (1979) 102.

<sup>179</sup> *A&K*, frag. 24: τοῖς γὰρ ὀργίοις Ἔρωτος ὑπηρετεῖν τὸν οἶνον | ἐντεῦθεν οἶνος λέγεται γάλα τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, “wine is the servant of Eros’ mysteries, which is why it is called the milk of Aphrodite”; Littlewood (1979) 102. Cf., however, *L&K* 2.3.3: οἶνος γὰρ ἔρωτος τροφή, “wine is the aliment of love”, which is a possible source for Manasses. On this passage of *L&K* as a possibly Byzantine addition, see Vilborg (1962) 42.

<sup>180</sup> See below, pp. 114–117.

<sup>181</sup> βλαστοῦ ἀμαράντου κλήμα, “a branch of an eternal root”, δένδρον ἀγλαόκαρπον, “a tree bearing beautiful fruit”, and ξύλον εὐσκιόφυλλον, “a shading tree”; Littlewood (1979) 104–105. On the Oriental connection, see *ibid.* esp. p. 104 and nn. 40–41.



λεισμένος, another standard image for Mary, and a possible connection to the walled gardens of the novel.<sup>182</sup>

The model for the garden ekphrasis is the Homeric garden of Alcinous in the *Odyssey* (7.112–31). Hysminias alludes to it openly when he says “seeing this, I thought I beheld Alcinous’ garden and felt that I could not take as fiction the Elysian plain so solemnly described by the poets” (*H&H* 1.4.3).<sup>183</sup> Apart from being an overt reference to the literary background of the *topos*, the mentioning of the Elysian plain may also refer to the heavenly paradise or the afterworld.<sup>184</sup> That association may, according to Anthony Littlewood, have a certain significance for the relationship between the novel and the Saint’s Life, and for the reading of the novel as a mystery text.<sup>185</sup>

The other garden in which action takes place in *H&H* is the garden of Sostratos in Artykomis.<sup>186</sup> There, the dinners are not held in the garden, but at least near it, ἐγγὺς γὰρ παραδείσου τὰ τῆς τραπέζης ὁ Σώστρατος ἡτοιμάσατο, “for Sostratos had prepared the table near the garden” (*H&H* 9.8.2). The garden is not depicted in any detail; we only know that there is a laurel bush, under which Hysminias sits and reads the letter from Hysmine (9.8.2–9.10.2). The room of Hysminias is also situated by the garden,<sup>187</sup> and here he tells his story to Rhodope (9.12.2–9.13). Once again sitting by the laurel at the third dinner, Hysminias meets Hysmine in the garden and they work out their *mediatrix* arrangements there. At night they sneak out to meet in the garden (9.21.2–10.4.1). We must note the function of Sostratos’ garden in the latter part of the novel as a doubling of the function of that of Sosthenes in the first part; the second garden is the second meeting-place for Hysmine and Hysminias, now as slaves. Although important, it is not as

<sup>182</sup> Ibid. 106–107. Cf. *H&H* 1.8.4.

<sup>183</sup> Greek quoted above, p. 86. On Alcinous’ garden, see also below, pp. 211, 263–264.

<sup>184</sup> Littlewood (1979) 108–110; cf. Alexiou (1977) 37.

<sup>185</sup> Littlewood (1979) 109–110; cf. Merkelbach (1962) on the ancient novel, and Poljakova (1979) and Plepelits (1989) on *H&H*. Cf. also Beaton’s (1996<sup>2</sup>) view of the revival of the novel in Byzantium; above pp. 32, 54–55. On the relation between novel and hagiography, see Beck (1977). Littlewood refers to Manuel Philes’ mystical interpretation of *Kallimachos & Chrysorrhoe* as a Byzantine reading of the novel as a Christian allegory. One should keep in mind, though, that Philes wrote his poem almost 200 years after Makrembolites wrote *H&H*, and that the two authors thus may have understood the allusion quite differently. The mystical interpretation is also only one of Philes’ three possible readings of the novel. On Philes and his poem, see above, p. 31, n. 124.

<sup>186</sup> A garden is mentioned also in Eurykomis: the first dinner takes place “by the garden” (*H&H* 5.9.3), but it is never mentioned again.

<sup>187</sup> ἡ δὲ τοῦ Σωστράτου Ῥοδόπη περὶ τὸν κήπον γενομένη (πρὸ γὰρ τῆς πύλης ἦν, ἡ παρεκαθήμην αὐτός), “Rhodope, Sostratos’ daughter, came into the garden (which was by the door where I was seated)” (*H&H* 9.12.2).

important as the “original” garden of Sosthenes, and in the end the couple return to that setting (11.18.2).

One element of Sosthenes’ garden that is not part of the traditional garden *topos* is the highly artificial fountain in its centre (*H&H* 1.5). It is a pool, four cubits deep, with a central column in coloured marble. On top of the column sits a golden eagle spouting water from its beak, and around the basin are a number of *automata*: a goat with a shepherd, a hare, a swallow, a peacock, a pigeon, a turtle-dove, and a cockerel. Hysmine draws water from the dove’s beak to wash her hands and from the eagle’s beak to mix the wine (1.8.1–2). Water, preferably a spring, is a standard element in the garden ekphrasis, but the fountain here is extremely elaborated. There are no fountains in the gardens of the ancient novels, but there are descriptions of fountains in Byzantine literature. A similar fountain occurs in the novel of Eugenianos (*D&C* 1.77–115), although not as elaborately described; it was probably modelled upon the fountain in *H&H*.<sup>188</sup> In the so-called *Vita Basilii*, book 5 of *Theophanes Continuatus* fountains are set up by Basil within the Great Palace.<sup>189</sup>

The fountain in *H&H* is described in terms of Byzantine architectural description, with elaborated details of forms and colours.<sup>190</sup> The artistry of carvings and the perfection of joins that are emphasised in Makrembolites’ description have a parallel in John Geometres’ description of his garden wall.<sup>191</sup> The description of the fountain is mirrored in the description of Hysmine in *H&H* 3.6: they exhibit the same symmetrical perfection and harmony. While the fountain is a work of art, Hysmine’s features are natural, but they are still depicted in the same terms and with the same empha-

<sup>188</sup> Or, if one accepts the reversed internal sequence of the novels, that of Makrembolites was modelled upon Eugenianos’ novel.

<sup>189</sup> *Theophanes Continuatus*, 327.4–328.2; Barber (1992) 7 and n. 20. Cf. the “streams” in the description of the Aretai palace in Maguire (1990). Fountains were an important element in the design of Western Medieval gardens, see e.g. the garden in *Roman de la Rose*, also in the illumination in the MS Harley 4425, f. 12 (ca. 1490–1500). Fountains were also placed in the atrium court of the Christian basilica as a symbol of purification, and in the garden of monasteries both in East and West.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. e.g. Prokopios’ ekphrasis of Hagia Sophia, *De aedificiis* 1.1.27–78. On the fountain in *H&H*, see Barber (1992) 6–7.

<sup>191</sup> John Geometres, Ἐτέρα εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν κήπον; text no. 3 in Littlewood (1972) 10–13: 13.11–24. There are two epistolary descriptions on Geometres’ garden; on the other letter, see below, p. 182, n. 80. On Geometres’ description of the garden wall, see Barber (1992) 8–10. There are a number of similarities between Geometres’ and Makrembolites’ garden descriptions, and also between Geometres’ and Tatius’; see Littlewood, *ibid.* 46, 54–55.



sis. Natural beauty thus seems to be at its best when similar to art.<sup>192</sup> The interlocking descriptions of Hysmine and the fountain tie the heroine even closer to the garden; she *is* its very centre.<sup>193</sup>

The birds' *automata* that surround the fountain's basin have sensual connotations. Birds as symbols of fertility figure in Byzantine iconography of the Annunciation of St. Anne in accordance with the *Protevangelium* or *Gospel of James*.<sup>194</sup> Birds have a given place in the gardens of the ancient novels, but then, of course, living birds.<sup>195</sup> The eagle on the top of the column may be a symbol of Zeus and, also, of the eagle that will snatch away the sacrifice later on in the novel. *Automata* were popular at the Byzantine court from the time of Theophilos, whose golden tree with singing birds is one of the most famous examples.<sup>196</sup> It is clear that artifice is strongly emphasised in the Byzantine garden description.<sup>197</sup> The description of the fountain in *Vita Basilii* is, for example, more detailed than that of the garden,<sup>198</sup> and in *H&H* the fountain covers more than half of the ekphrasis. Barber underlines the control of nature that art exhibits in the Byzantine novels, and argues that "the garden provides a theatre for the demonstration of this control."<sup>199</sup>

Compared to the form of the garden *topos* in the ancient novel, the fountain displays an external aspect of a traditional motif. We may see this in relation to the so-called *Aktualisierungsversuche* that Hunger saw in the Komnenian novels, and which may be described as a conscious attempt on the part of the author to allude to the Byzantine reality, resulting in a certain

<sup>192</sup> Cf. e.g. Longus' emphasis on the beauty of art which is so artful that it recalls nature. Barber (1992) 16–18 compares the description of Hysmine to two other Byzantine descriptions of women; see also below, pp. 251–252.

<sup>193</sup> Cf. Barber (1992) 18 on the "male construction" of Byzantine women; cf. also Zeitlin (1990) on the garden in Longus' *D&C*.

<sup>194</sup> Littlewood (1979) 98 and n. 21; one example occurs in the cycle of the Life of the Virgin in the narthex of Kariye Djami in Istanbul.

<sup>195</sup> See e.g. *L&K* 1.15.7–8.

<sup>196</sup> On the artifice at the courts of Theophilos and Constantine VII, see Barber (1992) 6–7; on Byzantine *automata*, Brett (1954) and Schissel (1942) 25–26. Mechanical toys do, however, appear in literature earlier than this in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* 3.169–79; Littlewood (1979) 99, n. 26.

<sup>197</sup> See e.g. Schissel (1942) 23–24; Barber (1992).

<sup>198</sup> In *Theophanes Continuatus* there are 20 lines on the fountain (327.4–328.2) and six on the garden (328.21–329.3); Barber (1992) 7, n. 20

<sup>199</sup> Barber (1992) 10; cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 66, "nature is revered only insofar as it conforms to the laws of art, and not the other way about", and p. 68 on the antithesis of art and nature. But cf. the ekphrasis tradition, in which nature and art do not necessarily contrast and rival, but also complement and co-operate.

“realism”.<sup>200</sup> Even if it may be hazardous to speak of conscious attempts,<sup>201</sup> there is definitely a change in the shaping of traditional motifs in the Byzantine novel. It is also possible that the introduction of elements which the contemporary reader could recognise was an allusion to an existing work of art, or to another literary description. We should note that we have several extant examples of both pictorial and literary representations of the twelve months, in detail corresponding with that of Makrembolites.<sup>202</sup>

We will not discuss the paintings at this point, but return to them later in the discussion on theme. We will then see how, *within* the garden motif, the themes of the novel are expressed by means of the paintings.

#### DREAMING OF EROS

Dreaming is a motif that occurs also in the ancient novel, then most often as a way of anticipating the coming action.<sup>203</sup> Hysminias' dreaming is engendered by the paintings on the garden walls; the first dream (*H&H* 3.1) occurs after he has seen the painting of Eros. We will look at the passages describing this, Hysminias' first impression of Eros, before considering the dream.

Μετάγομεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν μετὰ τὰς παρθένους γραφὴν καὶ δίφρον ὀρώμεν ὑψηλὸν καὶ λαμπρὸν καὶ ὄντως βασιλικόν· Κροίσου δίφρος ἐκεῖνος ἡ πολυχρύσου Μυκλήνης τυράννου τινός. 2 Τῷ δ' ἐπεκάθητο μεираκίον τερατωδες, γυμνωσιν παντελὴ καθ' ὅλου φέρων τοῦ σώματος· πρὸς δὲ δὴ βλέπων ἡσχυρόμεν αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἔπους ἐμνήσθη ὡς τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν κάρτ' ἀνώδυνον κακόν. 3 Τόξον καὶ πῦρ περὶ τῷ χεῖρι τοῦ μεираκίου, φαρέτρα περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν καὶ σπάθη ἀμφικόπος· τῷ πόδε μὴ κατ' ἀνθρώπου τῷ μεираκίῳ, ἀλλ' ὅλου περὶ τὰ δέ γε περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν οὕτω τερπνὸν τὸ μεираκίον, ὑπὲρ μεираκίου πᾶν, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν παρθένον, θεῶν ἄγαλμα, εἰδωλὸν Διός, ὅλος κεστός Ἀφροδίτης, Χαρίτων ὅλος λειμών, ὅλος ἡδονή. 4 Ἄν Θέτιδος γάμος, ἂν Ἡρα περὶ τὸν γάμον, ἂν Ἀφροδίτη, ἂν Ἀθηνᾶ, ἂν καὶ τοῦτ' ὁ μεираκίον, ἂν Ἔρις κυκᾶ τὸ συμπόσιον, ἂν μήλον πλάττη, ἂν τὸ μήλον ζητῇ λαβεῖν τὴν καλὴν, ἂν Πάρις κριτής, ἂν τὸ μήλον ἄθλον τοῦ κάλλους, ἔχεις τὸ μεираκίον τοῦτο. 5 Καὶ πρὸς τὸν Κρατισθένην εἶπον ὥς ἄρα καινόν τι χρῆμα ζωγράφου χεῖρ· τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν τερατουργεῖ καὶ πλάττει τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ τὰ πλάσματα τεχνουργεῖ. Εἰ δέ γε βούλει, φιλοσοφήσωμεν τὸ μεираκίον.' (*H&H* 2.7)

We turned our eyes to the picture that came after the maidens, and we saw a lofty throne that was brilliant and truly imperial—the throne of Kroisos or of some lord

<sup>200</sup> Hunger (1968) 72–73; on the concept of realism, see above, pp. 90–91.

<sup>201</sup> Cf. Smith (1999) 185, who argues that it is not possible to speak of any consciousness, and that the material is too scanty to judge.

<sup>202</sup> See below, p. 127, n. 284.

<sup>203</sup> See further below, pp. 108–109, 110.



of Mycenae rich in gold. 2 On this was seated an awesome young lad, with every part of his body naked. Looking at him I was abashed and remembered the saying: *to have no sense is a harmless wrong*. 3 There were a bow and a torch in the lad's hands, a quiver at his loins and a two-edged sword; the lad's feet were not human but were entirely winged; as for his head, the lad was so charming that he outdid every other lad, every maiden, he was an image of the gods, a statue of Zeus, he was entirely Aphrodite's girdle, entirely the meadow of the Graces, entirely pleasure. 4 If Thetis' wedding were to take place, if Hera were present at the wedding along with Aphrodite and Athena and this lad, if Eris were to disturb the symposium, if she were to make the apple, if she were to ask that the most beautiful receives the apple, if Paris were to judge, if the apple were the prize for beauty—then you would grasp the full impact of this lad. 5 And I said to Kratisthenes, 'What a clever thing is the painter's hand. It creates supernatural wonders, it devises imaginary objects with its intelligence and then brings them into being with its art. If you like, let us discuss the lad.'

Hysminias then goes on to give his interpretation of the painting:

Ἀγχίθυροι ταῖς ἀρεταῖς αἱ κακίαι, καὶ ταύταις παραπεπῆγασιν. Πρὸς τοῦτο δὴ τὸ γυνάτευμα τὸ μεράκιον ἀναπέπλασται, καὶ τέχνη τὸ πλάσμα πρὸς φύσιν μετήγαγεν. (H&H 2.8.1)

*The vices are neighbours to the virtues and are annexed to them.* It is to this motto that the lad has been created, and art has brought the creation to life.

The expression that Hysminias quotes goes back to Aristotle,<sup>204</sup> and can be found in, among others, the church fathers.<sup>205</sup> The insertion of the maxim here may reflect the Aristotelian interests of the twelfth century, which we will return to in a while.<sup>206</sup> Hysminias does not understand who the portrayed youth is; he interprets the painting according to its apparently Byzantine imperial context: the despot on his throne.<sup>207</sup> The painting's iconography is thus a false signal both to Hysminias and to the reader, and

<sup>204</sup> Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1106b36; Agapitos (1998a) 144, n. 125; cf. MacAlister (1991) 203.

<sup>205</sup> See e.g. Gregory of Nazianzos, funeral oration on Basil of Caesarea (*Or.* 43.64, *PG* 36.581b ὅτι παραπεπῆγασιν ταῖς ἀρεταῖς αἱ κακίαι καὶ εἰσὶ πῶς ἀγχίθυροι). On the passage, see also Cupane (1974) 252 and ead. (2000) 44, n. 119; Conca (1994a) 521, n. 16; Plepelits (1989) 182, n. 20.

<sup>206</sup> It is, however, probable that Gregory of Nazianzos, being one of the most frequently quoted ancient authors in Byzantium, was the Byzantines' source; cf. below, pp. 132–134 on Synesios and Theophylact. The maxim was used also in the 12th-century *Life of Saint Cyril Phileotes* 29.2, p. 128 in Sargologos (1964): παραπεπῆγασιν, φησὶ, ταῖς ἀρεταῖς αἱ κακίαι καὶ εἰσὶ πῶς ἀγχίθυροι; MacAlister (1991) 203. MacAlister's interpretation is criticised by Cupane (2000) 43–44.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. Synesios, *On Kingship* 6c; Theophylact of Ochrid, *Paideia Basilike* 17. These passages will be quoted and discussed below, pp. 132–134.

Kratisthenes is needed as an interpreter of the ancient motif. Hysminias is, however, not completely wrong; the juxtaposition of Sophrosyne and Eros embodies a main opposition in the novel.<sup>208</sup>

Hysminias then looks at the rest of the painting. The youth on the throne is surrounded by an “entire army” of people: men and women, old and young, kings and masters. Night and Day, represented as two women,<sup>209</sup> are standing there, and birds and fish and even a lion. They all stand like slaves around him as if he were a god. Hysminias is confused by this, and he finds and reads an inscription:

Ἔρως τὸ μειράκιον ὄπλα, πῦρ φέρον,  
τόξον, πτερόν, γύμνωσιν, ἰχθύων βέλος. (H&H 2.10.5)

The lad is Eros, with his weapons:<sup>210</sup> torch,  
bow, wings, nudity, and spear aimed at fishes.

Kratisthenes interprets the painting, explaining the powers of Eros for the still confused Hysminias, who is scared and distanced and says: *μηδὲ γινώσκειτό μοι*, “may I never know him” (2.11.3). He shows the same attitude until the end of book 2, “allow me to be chaste, my good friend, *for the gods love the chaste and hate evil men*” (2.14.4–6).<sup>211</sup> This is the background against which a furious Eros appears in Hysminias’ dream.

Καὶ δὴ με περὶ μέσσην νύκτα κατακοιμώμενον ἐνύπνιου ἦλθεν ὄνειρος μάλα φοβερός· ὁρῶ γὰρ περὶ τὸ δωμάτιον εἰσιὼν πλῆθος οὐκ εὐαρίθμητον, ὄχλου σύμμικτον ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν, νεανίσκων, παρθένων· λαμπαδηφόροι πάντες τὴν δεξιάν, τὴν γὰρ τοι λαιὰν περὶ τὸ στήθος εἶχον δουλοπρεπῶς. 2 Καὶ μέσον τὸ περὶ τὸ τοῦ κήπου θριγγίου μειράκιον, τὸν γεγραμμένον Ἐρωτα, τὸν βασιλέα, τὸν φοβερόν ἐκείνου, ἐπὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ πάλιν δίφρου καθήμενον· 3 ὡς ἐκ βροντῆς δέ μοι κατερράγη φωνή· πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸν δυνάστην, τὸν ἐλεύθερον, τὸν μὴ φρίσσοντά μου τὸ βέλος, τὸν μὴ φοβούμενον τὸ πτερόν, τὸν λοιδοροῦντα τὸ πῦρ, τὸν αἰσχυνόμενόν μου τὴν γύμνωσιν, τὸν ὡς μειρακίου καταμακώμενον, τὸν ἀσπαζόμενον τὸν ζωγράφον, εἰ τὸ ῥόδον βδελύξαιτο, τὸν τὴν ἐμὴν φίλην Ὑσμίνην αἰσχύναντα, ὃν ὡς σῶφρονα φιλοῦσι θεοί· 4 Ἐγὼ δ’ εἰλκόμεν ἑλεεινῶς, ὅλος ἔντρομος, ὅλος ἄφρων, ὅλος νεκρὸς καὶ κατὰ γῆν κείμενος. ‘Φεῖσαι, βασιλεῦ,’ ἀκούω φωνῆς, καὶ μικρὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν γεγωνὼς καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνατείνας ὁρῶ τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἐστεφανωμένην ῥόδῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν, ῥόδον τῇ δεξιᾷ φέρουσας, τῇ λαιᾷ τῶν ποδῶν ἐχομένην τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ‘φεῖσαι’ λέγουσαν ‘Ὑσμινίου φεῖσαι, βασιλεῦ, δι’ ἐμέ’

<sup>208</sup> See further below, pp. 131–132, on this passage and on oppositions in the novel.

<sup>209</sup> On the personifications of Night and Day, see Cupane (1974) 260, n. 49. For an example of one of these “ancient” figures in Byzantine art, see the Prayer of Isaiah in the Paris Psalter; fig. 66 in Talbot Rice (1963).

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Plepelits (1989) 182, n. 26, whose interpretation seems highly dubious.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Sophocles, *Aj.* 132–133; see further below, p. 273.



ἐγὼ σοι τοῦτον δουλογραφῆσω.' 5 Καὶ πρὸς τὴν παρθένον ὁ βασιλεὺς 'διὰ σέ καὶ ὠργίσθην, διὰ σέ καὶ διαλλάσσομαι.' 'Ἡ δ' εὐθὺς λαβομένη μου τῆς χειρὸς ἐξανέστησε, θαρρεῖν ἐπιτρέψασα. Καλεῖ με τοῖνυν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῇ χειρὶ καὶ στεφανοῖ μου ῥόδῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν' τὸ δὲ παρεστὼς ἅπαν ἠλάλαζεν, ἐκροτάλιζεν, 6 ὠρχεῖτο 'ὁμόδουλος Ὑσμινίας' λέγον 'ἡμῖν, ὁ θρασὺς, ὁ παρθένος, ὁ τῆς δάφνης ἐστεφανωμένος, ὁ τὴν καλὴν Ὑσμίνην αἰσχύνας.' 'Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἔρως πρὸς τὴν καλὴν Ὑσμίνην εἰπὼν 'ἔχεις ἐραστὴν' ἀπέπτῃ μου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅλος περὶ μέσῃ μου τὴν καρδίαν πεσών. (H&H 3.1)

And then about midnight while I was sleeping, a vision came to me, a rather terrifying dream; for I saw a crowd of inestimable size entering the room, a mixed throng of men, women, youths, maidens. All held torches in their right hands while their left they placed on their breasts in a servile manner. 2 And in the middle was the lad who was painted on the wall around the garden, Eros, the king, that terrifying figure, seated on his golden throne once more. 3 A voice was unleashed against me like thunder, 'Bring to me the usurper, the one who is at liberty, who does not fear my arrow, who is not frightened of my wings, who reviles my fire, who is embarrassed before my nudity, who mocks at me for being a young lad, who embraces the painter, even though he abhors the rose, who spurned my beloved Hysmine and whom the gods love for his chasteness.' 4 I was dragged along pitifully, quite trembling, quite dumb, quite dead, and lay on the ground. 'Spare him, my king', I heard a voice saying, and coming to myself a little and raising my eyes I saw Hysmine, her head crowned with roses, a rose in her right hand and her left hand clasping the king's feet; she was saying 'Spare Hysminias, spare him for my sake, my king; I shall recruit him for your service.' 5 And the king said to the girl, 'It is for your sake that I am angry, so for your sake I receive him back in favour.' She immediately took my hand and made me stand up, telling me to be confident. The king summoned me with a gesture and crowned my head with roses. All the bystanders cried out and applauded, 6 and danced around, saying, 'Hysminias has become our fellow slave, the bold, the unwed, who was crowned with laurel, who spurned the lovely Hysmine.' Then saying to the beautiful Hysmine, 'You have your lover', the king Eros flew away from my eyes and plunged deep into my heart.

Hysminias' stubborn chastity has provoked the god to act. It is interesting to note here how the dream sequence, along with the painting and the following discussion, displays a rather complex pattern of repetition with variation. We have already seen how the dream shows Eros just as he was in the painting: the same "king" surrounded by a throng of people. In addition, the attitude that Eros blames Hysminias for has been explicitly displayed: according to Eros, Hysminias claims to be at liberty (2.14.4–6); he does not fear his dart or wings, reviles his fire, is embarrassed before his nudity and despises his youth (2.10.2–3); he embraces the painter but abhors the rose (2.6.6); he spurns Hysmine (1.9.3); and he claims to be loved by the gods

for his chastity (2.14.6). Hysminias wakes up terrified and calls for Kratisthenes, to whom he relates the dream:

Καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν ὕπνον ἐξηγούμην αὐτῷ, τὴν προπομπὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ποικίλον τῆς προπομπῆς, τὰς ἐν χερσὶ λαμπάδας, τὸν ἐπὶ δίφρου θεόν, τὸν ἐπ' ἐμὲ θυμόν, τὴν ὥς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταρραγεῖσαν φωνήν, τὸν ἐμὸν ἐλκυσμόν, τὴν ἐμὴν πάθωσιν, τὴν τῆς Ὑσμίνης φωνήν, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρεσβείαν, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ συγγνώμην καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸν στέφανον. (*H&H* 3.3.2)

And I told him all about my dream, the god's procession, the diverse escort, the hand-held torches, the god on his throne, his anger against me, the voice that pealed down as from heaven, my being hauled away, what I suffered, Hysmine's speech, her supplication on my behalf, the god's pardon, and to finish it all, of the crown.

Kratisthenes explains to Hysminias that what he suffers from is love, and that it is nothing out of the ordinary. He adds that Hysminias is fortunate, "for your beloved is so beautiful and so completely responsive and you have Eros as your assistant" (3.3.3).<sup>212</sup>

These passages show that dreams and paintings have a narrative function as a means of exploiting the repetitive scheme of telling and retelling in a slightly different manner. First appears the painting, which supplies both a psychological background and a literary model. Then follows the dream, which constitutes a psychological reaction and a literary repetition. Finally comes the discussion about the dream, which gives us a psychological explanation and another literary repetition. Repetition is also a way of stressing the importance of a motif or an event, and it is obvious that Eros and Hysminias' attitude to love are primary elements in the novel.

After the discussion with Kratisthenes, Hysminias dozes off half-dreaming (*H&H* 3.4), falls asleep again and experiences another dream, this time erotic (3.5–7). We have already described the literary repetition in the half-dreaming sequence.<sup>213</sup> The first part of the dream-sequence displays similar features, referring to previous events: 3.5 is modelled upon the previous dinners and the couple's erotic plays (1.7–11; 2.12–13), with the remarkable difference that Hysminias is now active, while Hysmine acts as a virgin (3.5.3; 3.5.7).<sup>214</sup> We may add that this dream can be explained also

<sup>212</sup> Greek quoted below, p. 125.

<sup>213</sup> See above, pp. 70–72.

<sup>214</sup> The second part (*H&H* 3.6) is an inserted ekphrasis of Hysmine. The third part (3.7) describes an erotic struggle in which Hysminias is again the active part, while Hysmine tries to fend him off (cf. 3.2.3–7). The dream apparently ends with Hysminias' first orgasm; on the passage as a wet-dream, see Alexiou (1977) 41, and also below, p. 196.



from a psychological point of view.<sup>215</sup> Its elements are variations of events that have taken place over the last few days. Now that Hysminias has admitted that he is in love, that he has been initiated into the mysteries of Eros by the god himself,<sup>216</sup> he feels free to indulge in physical pleasures, at least in his sleep.

In book 5 appears a whole series of dreams: Hysmine embracing Hysminias (*H&H* 5.1.1), Hysmine reclining beside him on a bed “strewn with erotic delights” (5.1.2), Hysmine and Hysminias in a bath (5.1.3), Hysmine and Hysminias being married (5.2), and finally a nightmare in which Hysminias is attacked by Hysmine’s mother Panthia and an army of vengeful women (5.3.3–5.4).<sup>217</sup> Hysminias wakes up terrified and again calls for Kratisthenes, who explicitly tells him what we have already noted in the previous dream sequences:

‘Πρὸς ὃ δὴ σφόδρα καταθρομβηθεὶς τὴν ψυχὴν σε τὸν καλὸν Κρατισθένην ἐπεκαλούμην πυκνά· καὶ δέδοικα μὴ τὸ μέλλον μοι τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐν ὀνείροις ὑπεζωγράφησεν· εἴθισται γὰρ τούτῳ προκηρύσσειν ἐν ὕπνοις τὰ μέλλοντα.’ 4 Καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης ‘μεθήμερινὴ φροντίς ἐστὶν ὄνειρος· ταῦτά σε καθυπέτρεχεν, ὅθ’ ὁ περὶ τὴν πύλην ψόφος ὑμᾶς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων διέσπασεν.’ (*H&H* 5.5.3–4)

‘It was when my soul was terrified by them that I called on you several times, good Kratisthenes; and I was afraid that the divine power had depicted my future in the dream, for it is accustomed to disclose future events through dreams.’ 4 Kratisthenes replied, ‘Dreams are about your daytime preoccupations. This is what was happening to you when the noise around the door separated you.’

Hysminias fears that dreams have the same function as they traditionally have in the ancient novels, and it is in that respect very interesting that the dream of the mother is closely modelled upon *L&K*.<sup>218</sup> In *H&H* dreams usually do not reflect future events. This deviation from the ancient novels can be explained in terms of the interest in Aristotelian dream theory in the twelfth century, which we will return to in a while. We should, however, note that one of the dreams does in fact mirror a true event: the marriage of Hysmine and Hysminias.<sup>219</sup> Part of the dream (*H&H* 5.1) is also repeated with variation in 5.16. The passage 5.1 may thus be seen as an anticipation

<sup>215</sup> On the psychological character of the dreams in *H&H*, see Hunger (1980) 24–25 and Alexiou (1977) 40–42.

<sup>216</sup> *H&H* 3.3.1; see below, p. 113.

<sup>217</sup> On this passage, see Alexiou (1977) 34; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 55.

<sup>218</sup> The dream will be quoted and analysed below, pp. 224–227, 283–286.

<sup>219</sup> See above, pp. 66–69.

on a literary level, which does not necessarily concern the external action of the novel—i.e. a part of the repetition with variation scheme.

Hysminias makes a remarkable comment on dreams in the following passage, when he is about to leave Aulikomis. When he sees the host of maidens in the garden, escorting him as he leaves Aulikomis, he says: “I thought I recognized the dream in these events” (*H&H* 5.6.3).<sup>220</sup> Not only, then, do dreams reflect daytime preoccupations; in this case reality resembles dreaming.

This may be seen in contrast to the next two dreams, which occur at the end of books 6 and 7 respectively. In the first of these two (*H&H* 6.18) Eros hands over Hysmine to Hysminias.<sup>221</sup> In the second (7.18–19), Eros saves Hysmine from the sea. The first dream vaguely mirrors the coming wedding, perhaps with a slightly ironical touch, considering the ill-omened atmosphere. Hysminias soon realises that he has been thwarted: ἐμὲ δ' ὄντως Ἔρως κατέπαιξε, καὶ τοὺς ὀνείρους, οὓς μοι κατέπλαττεν, ὄντως ὀνείρους ὁρῶ καὶ ὕπνους σαφεῖς, “Eros has truly deceived me, and the dreams which he invented for me I see now are truly dreams and are clearly the product of sleep” (7.10.3).<sup>222</sup> He is, however, not truly deceived; in the end, the marriage will take place.

The second dream too will turn out to mirror a true event (Hysmine will tell us of “the naked youth” in 11.14.1), but Hysminias has been misled by the previous dream, and comments, τὰ δ' ἦσαν πάντα καὶ πάλιν ὄνειροι δουλεύοντες Ἐρωτι, “and all this, once again, was but a dream and subject to Eros” (7.19).<sup>223</sup>

There remains one dream, placed at the end of the novel when the couple has been reunited. It is not described in detail, but seems to resemble the erotic dreams of books 3 and 5.

Καὶ πάλιν καθ' ὅλους αὐτοὺς τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἐδόκουν ὀρᾶν καὶ ταύτῃ συνέπαιζον· ὥσπερ γὰρ νοῦς πεινῶντος ἄρτον φαντάζεται καὶ ὕδωρ ὄνειροι τῷ διψῶντι, οὕτως ἐρώσῃ ψυχῇ πάντα πρὸς ἔρωτα μεταπλάττεται, καὶ διαλογισμοὶ καὶ τὰ καθ' ὕπνους φαντάσματα. (*H&H* 10.4.2)

Once again throughout my slumbers I seemed to see Hysmine and to sport with her. For just as a starving man's mind imagines bread and water fills the thirsty man's dreams, so for a soul in love everything—thoughts, sleeping visions—is directed towards passion.

<sup>220</sup> The passage has been quoted and discussed above, p. 73.

<sup>221</sup> The passage has been quoted and discussed above, pp. 66–68.

<sup>222</sup> See also *H&H* 7.17.9.

<sup>223</sup> On the vision of Eros in *H&H* 7.18–19, see Cupane (1974) 274–281, who compares the narrative scheme of Makrembolites to that of the French *Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors*.



The dream has been preceded by two sleepless nights (9.6.4; 9.11.3). No dreaming has been reported for the one-year period during which the couple have been separated.

In the ancient novel dreams usually anticipate coming events,<sup>224</sup> and their function shows an influence from contemporary dream interpretation.<sup>225</sup> In *H&H* dreams are no longer portentous, but erotic, and often also psychologically correct.<sup>226</sup> It has been shown by MacAlister how the function of dreams in the Byzantine novels instead reflects Aristotelian dream theory, deriving from treatises that were commented upon in the twelfth century.<sup>227</sup> An explicit sign of that connection is the comment of Kratisthenes in 5.5.4, *μεθ'ημερινῇ φροντίς ἐστὶν ὄνειρος*, "dreams are about your daytime pre-occupations."<sup>228</sup>

The dream motif in *H&H* thus has an external, most probably contemporary element to it.<sup>229</sup> On a literary level the dream motif is used as the perfect means of exploiting the device of repetition and doubling: the hero experiences a dream which reflects actual events that have already been told, and then he discusses them with his friend. Sometimes the dreams mirror events that have already taken place, or will take place several times (the dinners, for example); sometimes they do in fact, however vaguely, mirror events to come; sometimes they thwart the hero-narrator completely. Their main function is to make Hysminias fall in love.<sup>230</sup> The traditional dream-motif has thus been combined with both the Aristotelian theories of dream interpretation and the literary device of repetition with variation.

---

<sup>224</sup> Bartsch (1989) 80–108; see also Alexiou (1977) 40, n. 45 with examples from *L&K* and Longus.

<sup>225</sup> MacAlister (1996) 33–43.

<sup>226</sup> Alexiou (1977) 38–40.

<sup>227</sup> MacAlister (1990, 1996). Commentaries were written mainly by Eustratios, Metropolitan of Nicea, and Michael of Ephesos, on, among other works, the *Parva naturalia*, sections of the *Organon*, the *Nicomachean ethics*, and the *Rhetoric*.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De divinatione per somnia* 463a; MacAlister (1990) 203. On dreams as remnants of sensory impressions, see also Plato, *Timaeus* 45b–46a, and Aristotle, *De insomniis* in *Parva naturalia* 459b–461a; MacAlister, *ibid.* 198.

<sup>229</sup> Cf. Hunger (1968) 72–73 on so-called *Aktualisierungsversuche*.

<sup>230</sup> See also MacAlister (1990) 201. Cf. Smith (1999) 191 on love as conversion following vision and Eros' intervention in the *Achilleid*. On a literary level, although the protagonist here is a girl, the passage may be compared to *H&H*; cf. also the *Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors* as described by Cupane (1974).

## SLAVERY

There are two types of slavery in *H&H*: servitude to Eros and servitude to human masters/mistresses; both aspects are strongly emphasised. It has been argued by Cupane that Makrembolites' image of *Eros basileus* shows an influence from the West: Eros as a king surrounded by his vassals shows similarities with the French *Dieu d'Amor* as he appears in the courtly love literature of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.<sup>231</sup> The idea of being a slave to one's passions and thus to Eros is, however, not a Medieval invention. It appears in the Hellenistic tradition and in the ancient novels.<sup>232</sup> It may thus be argued that all the elements needed for the representation of *Eros basileus* can be found in Greek literature, and that a Western influence is no prerequisite.<sup>233</sup> Furthermore, the contemporary imagery of the emperor and of Christ should be taken into consideration. Not only the emperor, but also Christ is βασιλεύς, and the emperor is, correspondingly, often characterised by divine attributes.<sup>234</sup> Eros on the throne surrounded by his subjects thus recalls an image of both imperial and Christian authority well known to a Byzantine audience.<sup>235</sup>

It has been suggested by Aleksidze that the other kind of slavery in *H&H*, servitude to human masters, reflects a social situation in Byzantium and thus is an expression of Makrembolites' sense of "democracy".<sup>236</sup> The thought has been rejected by Hunger who, however, himself sees a possible connection to a historical reality, since there were prisoners of war taken in twelfth-century Byzantium.<sup>237</sup> The motif goes back to the ancient novel, in which the protagonists often are made prisoners and slaves, and may accordingly not need any further explanation. What is interesting is the combination of the two aspects of slavery in *H&H*, and the extreme emphasis on both of them.

<sup>231</sup> Cupane (1974) esp. 150–161; cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 57–59, 155–158, 212.

<sup>232</sup> See e.g. *Anth.* 5.22. See also the fragment from Iamblichos, quoted by Hunger (1980) 23, n. 98: ὅταν ὁ Ἔρως ζηλοτυπίαν προσλάβῃ τύραννος ἐκ βασιλέως γίνεται, fr. 4 Habrich; trans. by Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 59, n. 32: "Eros, when he becomes jealous, is no longer a king but a tyrant." Cf. Euripides, *Hippolytus* 534: ἔρωτα...τὸν τύραννον ἀνδρῶν. On the motif in the ancient novels, see below, 2.2.4.

<sup>233</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 58–59, 156; Agapitos & Smith (1992) 37; Magdalino (1992).

<sup>234</sup> On the emperor and Christ in Byzantine literature, see Agapitos (1989a) esp. 292–294. On the emperor in 12th-century Byzantine art, see Magdalino & Nelson (1982).

<sup>235</sup> Agapitos & Smith (1992) 37, cf. Cupane (1974) 259–260; Magdalino (1992).

<sup>236</sup> Aleksidze's study of the Byzantine novels was published in 1965; I have not read his work, but refer to it based on the references of Hunger (1978) II, 141, n. 30.

<sup>237</sup> Hunger, *ibid.*



On a narratological level, the two aspects of the motif must be seen in relation to the twofold structure of the plot, i.e. the repetition of the first part of the story in the second part of the novel. We have already looked at the description of the painting of Eros, in which a throng of people and animals stood around the god as slaves (*H&H* 2.9); this is the first mention of slaves or slavery, which means that until this part of the story, Hysminias has been free in every respect. Therefore he does not understand why these people and animals act as slaves, and when he is told by Kratisthenes, he is frightened (2.11). It is quite obvious that Hysmine, on the other hand, has already been struck by love, but this is not explicitly shown until the dream sequence, in which she appears crowned with roses to save Hysminias from Eros' wrath. She says "spare Hysminias, spare him for my sake, my king; I recruit him for your service" (3.1.4).<sup>238</sup> Eros agrees to do so, and the bystanders applaud Hysminias as their fellow slave (3.1.6). Hysminias wakes up terrified and describes his sufferings as a war between Zeus, as whose herald he came to Aulikomis, and Eros.

Ἐγὼ δ' ὠλώλειν εἶπον Κρατίσθευες Ὑσμίνη μ' ἀπόλλυσιν, Ὑσμίνη με σώζει· ὅλην φαρέτραν Ἔρως ἐξεκένωσέ μου κατὰ ψυχῆς, ὅλην μου τὴν καρδίαν ἐνέπηρσεν. 4 Εἰ σοι παρὴν ἰδεῖν, εἶδες αὐτὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς ὅπλοις, σὺν αὐτῇ φαρέτρᾳ, σὺν ὅλῳ πυρὶ τὴν ἐμὴν εἰσδύντα ψυχὴν. Οὐκέτι Διασίῳν κήρυξ ἐγώ, οὐκέτι θεράπων Διός, οὐκέτι παρθένος. Πόλεμος περὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐρράγη καρδίαν ἐξ Ἑρωτος καὶ Διός. 5 Ὁ μὲν οὖν δὴ Ζεὺς ὡς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μεγάλα βρουτᾶ καὶ καταβρουτᾶ· ὁ δ' ὡς ἀπὸ γῆς ὅλας ἐλεπόλεις κινεῖ καὶ κατασεῖει μου τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. Ὁ μὲν ὡς ἐκ νεφῶν ἀστραπηβολεῖ, ὁ δ' ὅλους κρατήρας πυρὸς ὡς ἀπὸ γῆς ὑπανάπτει μοι. 6 Πόλις ἐγώ, καὶ πόλις Διός· ἀλλ' Ἔρως πολιορκεῖ με καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅλον μεθέλλκεται. Διὸς ἐγὼ πηγὴ μεστὴ χαρίτων παρθενικῶν· ἀλλ' Ἔρως πρὸς πηγὴν Ἀφροδίτης μετοχετεύει με. 7 Διασίῳν κήρυξ ἦκον ἐξ Εὐρυκώμιδος, καὶ νῦν Ἀφροδίσιῳν ἐξ Αὐλικώμιδος· ἐκ δάφνης τότε, καὶ νῦν ἐκ ῥόδων στεφανοῦμαι τὴν κεφαλὴν. Τίς οὖν οὕτω θρασὺς τὴν ψυχὴν, στειρρὸς τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὸ στέρνον σιδήρεος, ὡς καὶ πρὸς μάχην ἀντέχειν θεῶν, καὶ ὅλους φέρειν αὐτοὺς πολιορκοῦντας καὶ ῥήσσοντας; Οὐκ ἔχω σθένειν, Κρατίσθευες.' (*H&H* 3.2.3–7)

'I have been destroyed, Kratisthenes. Hysmine destroys me, Hysmine saves me. Eros has emptied his entire quiver against my soul, he has burnt up my entire heart. 4 If you had been able to see it, you would have seen him penetrating my soul with his weapons, with the quiver, with all his fire. I am no longer herald of the Diasia, I am no longer Zeus' attendant, I am no longer chaste. War has broken

<sup>238</sup> On the verb *δουλογραφέω*, see Hunger (1980) 24, who suggested a neologism in analogy with *πολιτογραφέω*, but cf. now *LBG*, according to which the word appears in, among others, Theodoros Prodromos, p. 285, v. 378 in Gianelli (1963), and Nikephoros Basilakes, p. 119, l. 14 in Garzya (1984).

out in my heart because of Eros and Zeus. 5 Zeus thunders loudly from the heaven, as it were, and his thunder re-echoes; Eros moves up his siege engines from the ground, as it were, and assaults my citadel; the one hurls down lightning as from the clouds, the other kindles craters of fire against me as from the ground. 6 I am a city, the city of Zeus, but Eros lays siege to me and draws me entirely towards himself. I am the fountain of Zeus, full of the graces of chastity, but Eros diverts me towards the fountain of Aphrodite. 7 I came from Eurykomis as herald of the Diasia but now I shall leave Aulikomis as the herald of Aphrodite's festival. My head was crowned with laurel then, but is crowned now with roses. Whose soul is so bold, whose heart so steadfast, whose chest made of such stout iron that he can resist the gods in battle and withstand them all as they lay siege and smite him? I have not the strength, Kratisthenes.' <sup>239</sup>

When Kratisthenes asks why Hysminias has changed so completely from being chaste, he answers "Ερως αὐτός με μυσταγωγεῖ, "Ερως αὐτὸς μεταπλάττει με· χεῖρ "Ερωτος τὴν ἐμὴν ταύτην κεφαλὴν ἐστεφάνωσε καὶ μετεστεφάνωσε, "Eros himself initiates, Eros transforms me. It was Eros' hand that crowned this head of mine and changed its crown" (3.3.1).<sup>240</sup> He does not yet mention the word "slave"; it is not until he has accepted his love for Hysmine that he returns to the painting in the garden and makes his reverence to Eros "as a slave should", saying

‘τῆς ἐξουσίας σου εἰμι, βασιλεῦ. Οὐκέτι παλινοστήσω πρὸς Εὐρυκώμιδα· οὐκέτι προσπόλοις Διὸς συνταχθήσομαι· ἔχει με πολίτην Αὐλίκωμις ἐξ ἐρωτικῶν γραφῶν πολιτογραφούμενον.’ (H&H 3.8.3)

'I am in your power, my king. I shall never return to Eurykomis; I shall never again be enrolled among the attendants of Zeus.<sup>241</sup> Aulikomis has me as a citizen, inscribing me in its citizen rolls through paintings about love.'

The author has taken the opportunity to play on the words here. The citizenship, *πολιτογραφέω*, refers to *δουλογραφέω* in 3.1.4; as the lover of Hysmine and a slave to her passion he has become, or rather should have become, a citizen of Aulikomis. As we know, Hysminias *will* return to Eurykomis; however, it is to Aulikomis that he returns after the journeys, to celebrate the wedding with Hysmine.<sup>242</sup>

<sup>239</sup> The passage may be compared to H&H 3.7.1–5, in which Hysmine defends herself against Hysminias' advances, described in terms of fortification; cf. also 2.14.4, where Hysminias is described as a deserter (*λειποτάξιος*). Military metaphors are common in erotic literature; for references see Conca (1994a) 529, n. 4.

<sup>240</sup> Cf. L&K 1.9.7; 2.19.1; 2.37.5; 5.15.6; 5.26.3; 5.26.10. On H&H 3.3.1, see Conca (1994b) 104.

<sup>241</sup> This is the betrayal that is alluded to in H&H 11.21.3; cf. above, p. 75 and n. 78.

<sup>242</sup> The word-play connected to *γραφή* will be discussed below, pp. 134–135.



In the remaining part of book 3—only two chapters—the slavery motif recurs frequently. Kratisthenes mentions it three times in his monologue (*H&H* 3.9.3, 3.9.6 and 3.9.7). Hysminias himself makes two statements on his servitude to love (3.10.2 and 3.10.5). They both illustrate his change from chaste to passionate, a change that is underlined by the use of the word *καινός* in the second passage: οὕτως ἐγὼ δουλογραφοῦμαι τῷ Ἐρωτι καινὴν τινα δούλωσιν καὶ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐδέπω δεδούλωται, οὐ μόνον σώματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆς, “thus I was enrolled in a novel servitude to Eros, a servitude which no one else had experienced, involving not only the body but also the soul” (3.10.5). Even if love is known already in the ancient literary tradition to embrace both body and soul, Hysminias is inexperienced and sees it as a new and strange thing.<sup>243</sup>

In book 4, slavery is only mentioned once, in the discussion of Eros’ powers; in book 5 four times;<sup>244</sup> in book 6 none; in book 7 five times.<sup>245</sup> In book 8 Hysminias is taken prisoner, and the other aspect of the slavery motif comes to the fore. Before moving on to that, we will look at the imagery of roses, which is apparently connected with the servitude to Eros.<sup>246</sup>

The rose and the laurel are continuously juxtaposed throughout the novel as symbols of love/sex and chastity/virginity. As the herald of the Diasia, Hysminias is garlanded with laurel (*H&H* 1.1.2; 1.2.1).<sup>247</sup> When he is enslaved/initiated by Eros he is garlanded with roses (3.1.5). He has already, chaste as he is, shown that he abhors the rose, which has incensed Eros (3.1.3).<sup>248</sup> Hysmine, when she appears before Eros, is garlanded with roses, holding a rose in her right hand (3.1.4). She has previously not appeared like this, but her surroundings and her appearance are continuously connected with roses, particularly her home. When Hysminias arrives at Aulikomis he is greeted with sprays of rose-water (1.3.1), and in the garden of Sosthenes there are roses in different stages of bloom: τῶν ῥόδων τὸ μὲν προκύπτει τῆς κάλυκος, τὸ δ’ ἐγκυμονεῖται, ἄλλο προκέκυφεν, ἔστι δ’ ὃ καὶ πεπανθὲν κατὰ γῆν ἐρρύη, “as for the roses, one was emerging from the bud, another was

<sup>243</sup> On the physical effects of and emotional reactions to love in the Komnenian novels, see Jouanno (2000).

<sup>244</sup> *H&H* 5.12.1; 5.18.2; 5.20.1; 5.20.2. On *H&H* 5.18.1, see below, p. 134.

<sup>245</sup> *H&H* 7.9.3; 7.11.5; 7.17.9; 7.18.3; 7.19. On *H&H* 7.9.3, see below, p. 134.

<sup>246</sup> The rose is traditionally a symbol of erotic love. For the imagery and symbolism of the rose in *L&K*, see Laplace (1991).

<sup>247</sup> Repeated throughout the novel: *H&H* 3.1.6; 5.3.5; 8.13.1; 8.15.1; 10.10.10; 11.13.2.

<sup>248</sup> Hysminias thanks the painter in *H&H* 2.6.6, referring back to 2.4.2 (Sophrosyne is not garlanded with roses); see above, p. 106.

swelling, yet another had already emerged; and some which had already reached maturity were spread on the ground" (1.4.1). Likewise, when Hysminias leaves Aulikomis, there are roses in the procession, and when he arrives at Artykomis, along with his master herald, there are roses there as well (9.1.2). Although there are processions also in Eurykomis and Daphnepolis, these are the only processions in which roses are mentioned.

The description of the roses in the garden of Sosthenes as an image of Hysmine becomes clear when reading some of the later passages. First of all *H&H* 3.1.3, already discussed above: when Eros summons Hysminias he calls him "he who embraces the painter, even though he abhors the rose," which probably should be read "he who likes the painter, but dislikes Hysmine."<sup>249</sup> Then follows a number of passages in which Hysmine is likened to the rose, for example in book 4: οὐ γάρ με στερήσει πόνος γλυκύτητος μέλιτος, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἄκανθα ρόδου τοῦ ρόδου κωλύσει με, "for the pain will not deprive me of the honey's sweetness, as the rose's thorns do not turn me away from the rose" (4.22.3). In book 5 there is a longer passage in which the unplucked rose symbolises virginity:

"Ἵσμινία' λέγουσα 'φείσαι παρθενίας ἐμῆς' μὴ πρὸ τοῦ θέρου ἐκτίλῃ τοὺς στάχυν· μὴ τὸ ρόδον τρυγῆσθαι πρὸ τοῦ προκύψαι τῆς κάλυκος, μὴ τὴν σταφυλὴν ὀμφακίζουσιν, μὴ πως ἀντὶ νέκταρος ὅξος ἐκθλίψῃς ἐξ ὀμφακος. 2 Σὺ θερίσεις τὸν ἄσταχυν, ἀλλ' ὅταν λευκανθῇ σοι τὸ λήιον· σὺ τὴν ροδωνιὰν ἀπανθίσεις, ἀλλ' ὅταν πεπανθῇ τὸ ρόδον προκύψῃ τῆς κάλυκος· σὺ τρυγήσεις τὴν σταφυλὴν, ἀλλ' ὅταν τὸν βότρυν ἴδῃς ὑπερπερκάσαντα. (*H&H* 5.17.1–2)

She said, 'Hysminias, spare my virginity; do not reap the ears of corn before the summer; do not pluck the rose before it bursts from the sheath; do not crush the ripening grape lest you press out vinegar from the cluster instead of nectar. You will reap the ears, but when the field is white for harvest; you will pluck the flowers of the rose garden, but when the mature bloom bursts from the sheath; you will harvest the grape, but when you see the clusters ripened.'

The same imagery is repeated by Panthia in 10.11.4, where she accuses the herald Hysminias who ὅλον μου τὸ κειμήλιον ἀπεσύλησεν, ἐθέρισέ μου τὸν ἄσταχυν, τὸν βότρυν ἐτρύγησε καὶ τὴν ροδωνιὰν ἀπηνθίστατο, "ravaged all my treasure, harvested the corn, culled the grape and plucked the flowers from my rose garden."<sup>250</sup> Here Hysmine is not only the rose, but a

<sup>249</sup> The passage has been quoted and discussed above, pp. 105–107.

<sup>250</sup> Cf. also the ekphrasis of Hysmine in *H&H* 3.6.4, the Lokrian rose in 9.16.5, and the fathers' lament in 10.12.3.



rose garden, and in another passage she explicitly presents herself as a garden to Hysminias (6.8.3).<sup>251</sup>

As we have seen, Hysminias in the novel's opening books is connected with the laurel, Hysmine with the rose. In book 5, however, when the couple leave Aulikomis, Hysmine is garlanded with laurel (*H&H* 5.6.2–3); she has resisted Hysminias' advances and is still a virgin. As soon as Hysminias' change has taken place, the two symbols are contrasted in his address to Apollo:

Διὸς κήρυξ σοῦ πατρὸς ἦκου ἐξ Ἑυρυκώμιδος εἰς Αὐλίκωμιν, ἐκ δάφνης ταύτης τῆς σῆς τὴν ἐμὴν ταύτην ἀθλίαν στεφανωθείς κεφαλὴν· ἀλλ' Ἐρωσος ἀδελφὸς ῥόδοις ταύτην ἀναστεφάνωσεν· 2 οὗτός μοι τὴν παρθενίαν ἐσύλησεν ἢ μᾶλλον ἐρωτικῶς ἀντηλλάξατο [...]. (*H&H* 8.10.1–2)

I came from Eurykomis to Aulikomis as herald of your father Zeus, my miserable head crowned with your laurel. But Eros, your brother, crowned me instead with roses. He robbed me of my virginity, or rather transformed it with erotic experiences, [...].

The same contrast is made in 3.2.7 and 8.13.1–2,<sup>252</sup> and even more explicitly—and also with clear reference to slavery—in 8.14.3–4:

Καὶ ὁ δεσπότης φησὶν 'εἰ μὲν σοι πατρίς περιφανὴς καὶ γένος λαμπρὸν καὶ τὰ κατ' οἴκους πολυτελῆ, νῦν τούτων ἔχεις οὐδέν· 4 δοῦλος εἶ καὶ δοῦλος ἡμῶν· εἰ δὲ καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ παρθενίας Ἀφροδίτην ἀντηλλάξω καὶ Ἐρωτα, εἰ δὲ καὶ στεφάνων δάφνης παρθενικῆς στέφανον ἐκ ῥόδων ἐρωτικόν, μὴ σὺ γε τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε· ἀλλὰ κτῆσαι τὸ σῶφρον καὶ τὸ φιλόσωφρον ἀγάπησαι, ἵνα μὴ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐξ ἔργων μάθῃς αὐτῶν καὶ χεῖρα δεσπότης κτήσῃ διδάσκαλον.' (*H&H* 8.14.3–4)

And my master said, 'If your country is illustrious and your lineage brilliant and your home luxurious, now you have none of those things: 4 you are a slave, and you are our slave. If you exchanged chastity and virginity for Aphrodite and Eros, the virgin's garland of laurel for the rose garland of passion, have nothing more to do with this! Cultivate chastity and love sobriety lest you learn chastity the hard way and find the master's hand a teacher.'

Hysminias has lost his garland of laurel, but he is still connected with it owing to outer circumstances: as a prisoner he passes Artykomis, where virgins are tested in the spring of Artemis, garlanded with laurel (*H&H* 8.7); he ends up in Daphnepolis, where there is an altar of Apollo (8.11.1) and where a feast of Apollo is celebrated in honour of Daphne (8.18). His previ-

<sup>251</sup> Quoted above, p. 99, where also the connection between the garden motif and the heroine was discussed. Cf. also Poljakova (1976) and Cupane (1974) on the possible connection with the French *Roman de la Rose*.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. also *H&H* 5.18.2, where Zeus is exchanged for Eros.

ous experiences are mirrored in those of his master, who now appears “crowned with laurel, adorned with a brilliant tunic and sacred sandals” (8.19).<sup>253</sup> In the garden of Sostratos in Artykomis, Hysminias sits under a laurel bush and reads the letter of Hysmine (9.8.1–9.10.2), and then he meets her there (9.16.1–9.20). Something strange happens at this point: Hysminias leaves the laurel bush after blessing it, calling it “a truly golden laurel, Apollo’s seed, earth’s offspring, Aphrodite’s monument and Eros’ solace” (9.20.1). It seems that Daphne has been reconciled with Eros and Aphrodite; virginity and passion are no longer necessarily opposites.<sup>254</sup> The couple are thereafter reunited with their parents by the altar of Apollo (by which grows a laurel tree, 8.11.1; 10.9.3), they are set free by the priest of Apollo, and they are finally garlanded with laurel (10.13.5; 11.1.1), both still virgins.<sup>255</sup>

In book 7, Eros appears in a dream saving Hysmine; Hysminias refers to the dream as *ὄνειροι δουλεύοντες Ἔρωτι*, “subject to Eros” (*H&H* 7.19). Shortly after this Hysminias is captured by pirates, and the references to slavery are thenceforth concentrated on servitude to human masters, and particularly the contrast between freeman and slave, the first example being 8.8.1: *δούλοι βαρβάρων ἐξ ἐλευθέρων*, “once free men but now the barbarians’ slaves.” The contrasting situations are often expressed in word-plays:

ἡμεῖς δ’ Ἑλληνικὴν βαρβαρικῆς δουλείας ἀντηλλασσόμεθα, καὶ δοῦλοι πάλιν ἐκ δούλων γεγόμενα, καὶ βαρβάροις δεσπότης γεγονότες ὁμόδουλοι καὶ αὐτοῖς δεσπότης συναιχμαλωτιζόμενοι ὁμογλώσσοις Ἑλλήσιν ἐδουλογραφούμεθα. (*H&H* 8.9.2)

We exchanged servitude to barbarians for servitude to Greeks, and having been slaves became slaves once again, becoming our barbarian masters’ fellow slaves and while in servitude with our former masters were enslaved to Greeks who spoke our language.

Shortly afterwards the two aspects of the motif are brought together:

Δοῦλος ἀντ’ ἐλευθέρου γεγένημαι καὶ τρίδουλος ἀντὶ κήρυκος, Ἔρωτι δουλογραφηθεὶς τὰ πρῶτα, καὶ βαρβάροις τούτοις τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ τρίτον τοῖς ἐκ τῆς σῆς ταύτης Δαφνηπόλεως Ἑλλήσι. (*H&H* 8.10.3)

<sup>253</sup> Note that the laurel garland is mentioned three times in the same chapter; cf. *H&H* 1.2.1 and 1.7 on Hysminias.

<sup>254</sup> Returning to the initial description of Sostratos’ garden, there were both laurel and roses in it (*H&H* 1.4.1; 1.4.3); but cf. above, p. 99, and below, p. 210 and n. 118, on the traditional plants of erotic/novelistic gardens.

<sup>255</sup> Note also the praise of the laurel/Apollo in the laments of the parents: *H&H* 10.10.13; 10.10.14; 10.11.11; 10.12.5.



I have become a slave instead of a freeman, a slave three times over instead of a herald, enslaved first to Eros, then secondly to the barbarians and now for the third time to these Greeks in your city of Daphnepolis.

The “triple servitude” appears another four times (8.11.1; 8.13.4; 9.7.1; 9.13.1). In one of these cases, the meaning of the expression has been altered:

Πάλιν Ὑσμινίας ἐγὼ τὰ δούλων ὑπέχω καὶ πάλιν δουλεύω καὶ ὁλος δοῦλος καὶ τριδούλος· δοῦλος Ὑσμίνης ἐξ Ἔρωτος, δοῦλος λογισμῶν ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ δοῦλος ἐκ τύχης τοῦ κήρυκος. (H&H 9.7.1)

Once again I, Hysminias, endured a slave's lot and once again was in servitude and suffered indeed a threefold servitude. Through Eros I was slave to Hysmine, through my eyes I was a slave to my thoughts, and through Fate I was the herald's slave.

Hysminias is a slave to his thoughts through his eyes, because he thinks he sees Hysmine in one of the slave girls at Sostratos' house in Artykomis. Only a few lines later (9.8.4) it is confirmed that the girl is indeed Hysmine; Hysminias was accordingly not a slave to his thoughts, because his suspicions proved to be right. During this period, i.e. from the time that Hysminias is captured by pirates until he is reunited with Hysmine (8.1–9.8), servitude to love is hardly mentioned; apart from the “triple servitude” we have only two examples. Firstly, in Hysminias' recapitulation of his experiences to his new master and mistress: καί μου τὸν στέφανον Ἔρως ἐσύλησεν, Ὑσμίνη παρθένω [...] ἀγκίστρῳ χρησάμενος· καὶ δοῦλος Ἀφροδίτης εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν Εὐρύκωμιν ἀνθυπέστρεψα, “and Eros robbed me of my garland, using as his lure Hysmine [...]. It was as a slave to Aphrodite that I returned to my city Eurykomis” (8.13.2).<sup>256</sup> Secondly, when Hysminias' love-sick mistress hears him lamenting Hysmine: τί τοσοῦτον καταβαπτίζῃ τοῖς δάκρυσιν; ἰδοὺ σοι παρίσταται· ἔχεις Ὑσμίνην ἐμέ, δέσποιναν σὴν καὶ δούλην ἐξ ἔρωτος, “why are you so drenched with tears? Look, she is standing here beside you! You have me as your Hysmine, your mistress and your slave in passion” (8.16.4). In both these passages, love and passion are described in a somewhat negative tone: in the first example, servitude to Aphrodite is the reason why Hysminias ended up a slave; in the second, the mistress tries to force herself upon an unwilling slave.

<sup>256</sup> This is not the first time that Aphrodite is mentioned (H&H 1.14.5; 2.7.3; 3.2.6; 5.12.4; 5.16.1; 5.20.2; 6.18.1; 7.10.5; 8.7.5; 8.14.3–4; 8.17; 9.3.2; 9.5.3; 9.13.3; 9.20.1; 10.2.2; 10.6.7; 11.19.3), but it is the first time that Eros seems to be replaceable by Aphrodite. Note especially 9.20.1 on Aphrodite, Eros and the laurel.

Obviously, Hysminias' new situation means that he has to abandon erotic slavery. We have already seen how freedom and slavery, rose and laurel are contrasted in *H&H* 8.14.4, but we will take a second look at the closing sentence of the paragraph, ἀλλὰ κτῆσαι τὸ σῶφρον καὶ τὸ φιλόσωφρον ἀγάπησαι, ἵνα μὴ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐξ ἔργων μάθῃς αὐτῶν καὶ χεῖρα δεσπότητος κτήσῃ διδάσκαλον, "but cultivate chastity and love sobriety lest you learn chastity the hard way and find the master's hand a teacher." Slavery to man seems to exclude slavery to Eros and instead require slavery to Sophrosyne. In a way Hysminias has to start all over again, and this must of course be seen in relation to the repetition of the story in the second part of the novel.

All other mentionings of slavery in this part of the novel concern Hysminias' new social status as a slave, and it is mentioned frequently, often in contrast to his previous freedom and position as a herald. There are a number of examples,<sup>257</sup> one will suffice here:

Καὶ οὕτω πέρας τὰ τῆς τραπέζης ἐδέχετο· καὶ ὁ τῶν Διασίων κήρυξ Ὑσμινίας ἐγώ, ὁ τῆς δάφνης στεφανωθείς, ὁ λαμπρῶς τὸ πρῶτον πλεύσας ἐξ Εὐρυκώμιδος, 2 ὁ περὶ τὴν Αὐλίκωμιν βασιλικῶς ἐφ' ἄρματος ἵππασάμενος, ὁ πολυτελῶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Σωσθένους λαμπρᾶς τραπέζης ἀνακλιθεὶς, ἐπὶ δουλικῆς τραπέζης νῦν ἀνακέκλιμαι σὺν ὁμοδούλων χορῶ καὶ τὰ τῶν δούλων ὑπηρετῶ καὶ ὅλος δοῦλός εἰμι καὶ ὅλην δουλείαν ἐνδέδουμαι καὶ ὅλην δουλοπρέπειαν ὑποκρίνομαι, ὅλον ἀποδυθεὶς, ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί, τὸ κηρύκειον καὶ ὅλον τὸ ἐλεύθερον. (*H&H* 8.15.1–2)

Thus the meal came to an end and I, Hysminias, the herald of the Diasia, who had been garlanded with laurel, who had formerly sailed sumptuously from Eurykomis, who had ridden in imperial splendour in a chariot to Aulikomis, who had reclined in luxury at Sosthenes' brilliant banquet, now reclined at table with my band of fellow slaves, and performed a slave's tasks, and was completely a slave, taking on a servile demeanour and functioning as a slave, quite stripped, o Zeus and the gods, of my herald's rank and that of a free man.

We see again how the experiences of Hysminias in the first part of the novel are relived through his master, with himself in a slave's position.

It is gradually revealed in three steps that Hysmine too has become a slave.<sup>258</sup> First, one of the slave girls reminds Hysminias of Hysmine:

καὶ θεραπαινὶς ἡ τῶν ποδῶν τὸ μάκτρον ἀνέχουσα πρὸ χειρῶν μικρὸν ὑπεστέναξεν, ὥσπερ μιμουμένη τὸ τῆς ἡχοῦς ὑστερόφωνον, καὶ οἶον Ὑσμίνην λεπτὸν ὑπεστέναξεν, ὅτε τῷ ποδί μου τὸν πόδα ταύτης ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Σω-

<sup>257</sup> *H&H* 8.11.2; 8.12.1; 8.12.2; 8.13.4; 8.14.4; 8.15.1–3; 8.16.2; 8.20.2; 8.21.3; 9.4.3.

<sup>258</sup> See also above, pp. 65–66 on the recognition scene.



σθένους τραπέζης ἐπέθλιψα. Εἶδον οὖν ἀτενῶς εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ νῆ τὴν Ὑσμίνην τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἐδόκουν ὀρᾶν· ἡ δ' ἀντέβλεπεν ἀτενέστερον. (*H&H* 9.5.3)

And the servant girl who was holding the towel for the feet in her hands moaned gently, as though imitating the echoes of my sigh, and sighed delicately as Hysmine had done when I pressed her foot with mine at Sosthenes' table. I looked at her intently and, by Hysmine, I thought I was looking at Hysmine, and she gazed at me even more intently.

The new, subordinate position of the couple is strongly emphasised in this passage, which is an exact repetition of their first evening together. Hysminias spends the whole night thinking of the slave girl and Hysmine (*H&H* 9.6). The next day he once again sees the girl and is reminded of Hysmine (9.8.1), and shortly after that a slave girl hands him a letter ἐξ Ὑσμίνης παρθένου σῆς ἐρωμένης καὶ νῦν ἐμῆς ὁμοδούλου, "from the maiden Hysmine, your beloved and now my fellow slave" (9.8.4); Hysmine refers to herself in the letter as Hysminias' ὁμόδουλος, "fellow slave" (9.9.3).

Hysminias' social status as slave continues to be emphasised,<sup>259</sup> until in *H&H* 10.9 the couple act as slaves for the last time, since they are soon to be freed. In books 9 and 10 appear, however, also some of the most interesting and elaborated word-plays on slavery, now that Hysmine's enslavement can be combined with that of Hysminias, and thus also with servitude to Eros.<sup>260</sup> When, on top of this, Hysmine's mistress Rhodope falls in love with Hysminias, and uses Hysmine as her mediator, the motif can be further elaborated:

Ὑσμίνη δ' ἐγὼ καὶ ζῶσα, κἂν αἰχμάλωτος διὰ σέ καὶ δούλη νῦν, ὡς ὀρᾷς· 3 ἡ δέ μοι δεσπότης, κἂν δεσπότης ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν ἐρωτικῶς καὶ δούλη σοι πρὸς ἔρωτα γέγονε καὶ μοι τὰ τοῦ πάθους θαρρεῖ, δούλης Ὑσμίνης τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐρωτικῶς ζητοῦσα· καὶ δεσπότης οὖσα δουλεύει τοῖς ἔρωσι. (*H&H* 9.17.2–3)

I am Hysmine, and alive, even if a prisoner because of you, and now a slave, as you see. 3 My mistress, even though she is a mistress, nevertheless suffers from passion and has become your slave in love, and has entrusted her affliction to me, seeking passionately for you Hysminias, the brother of the slave Hysmine. Though a mistress, she is in servitude to the Eroses.

And when Rhodope offers Hysminias freedom in exchange for love, the two aspects of slavery are explicitly juxtaposed in Hysmine's comment to Hysminias: μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν μεταδιώκων τῷ τῆς ἐλευθέρης Ῥοδόπης ἔρωτι

<sup>259</sup> *H&H* 9.11.3; 9.12.2; 9.13.1; 9.14.5; 9.15.3; 9.16.1; 10.4.1. On *H&H* 9.14.5, see below, pp. 158–159.

<sup>260</sup> *H&H* 9.11; 9.16.2; 9.16.5; 9.17.1; 10.7.3.

δουλωθῆς καὶ δουλωθῆς τὴν ψυχὴν φεύγων δούλωσιν σώματος, “do not in your pursuit of freedom become enslaved to the love of the free Rhodope and enslave your soul as you try to escape from bodily servitude” (*H&H* 9.16.4). There are a number of similar passages,<sup>261</sup> but the issue is to become still more complex when the love of Hysminias’ mistress is included:<sup>262</sup>

3 Οὕτως ἐρωτικῶς ἡμεῖς ἀνεκράθημεν καὶ τὸ φίλιον ὅλον ἐκοινωσάμεθα, ὡς κοινώσασθαι καὶ τὸ δούλιον καὶ πρὸς ἓν καθυπηρετῆσαι λειτουργήμα.

8 Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐμὴ δεσπότης τοῖς Ἐρωσι δουλογραφηθεῖσα τῇ κύλικί μοι προσέπαιξε καὶ κατέπαιξεν, ἢ μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ κύλιξιν αὐταῖς κατέπαιζον Ἐρωτες· 2 νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἐπέθλιβέ μου τὸν δάκτυλον, νῦν δ’ ὅλην μου τὴν χεῖρα τῇ κύλικι συνεφέιλκετο καὶ ἄλλ’ ἅττα κατέπαιξεν ἢ τοῖς Ἐρωσι κατέπαιζέτο· ὧν δὴ πάντων ὡς ἐκ πυρὸς φεύγων αὐτὸς Ὑσμίνη τῇ συνοινοχοευούσῃ συνέπαιζον, τῶν τῆς δεσποίνης παιγνίων τὰ τῆς δούλης ἀνταλλασσόμενος· 3 οἷς ἡ Ῥοδόπη συνένευε, καὶ τῇ δούλῃ παίζειν ἐπένευε καὶ οἶον διὰ ταύτης ἐδόκει παίζειν αὐτῇ· πρὸς ἃ δὴ βλέπων αὐτὸς τὴν Ῥοδόπην μᾶλλον δούλην εἶχον Ὑσμίνης ὡς καθυπηρετοῦσαν εἰς ἔρωτα. (*H&H* 10.7.3–8.3)

3 So we mixed the wine with passion and had our love in common so that we had our servitude in common and performed the one service.

8 So my mistress, enrolled in the service of the Erotes, flirted with me as I offered the cups and jested with me, or rather the Erotes flirted with her over me and the cups. 2 For at one moment she pressed my finger, at another she pulled my entire hand together with the cup and sported in other ways, or was made a game of by the Erotes. While I tried to escape from this as from a fire, I too flirted but with my fellow wine-pourer, Hysmine, exchanging games with the mistress for games with the slave; 3 this Rhodope approved and she allowed flirtation with the slave as though she thought she was flirting through her. Seeing this, I considered Rhodope a slave rather than Hysmine since she was assisting us in our love.

Again, the scene is reminiscent of the couple’s flirting a year earlier when they were free. In *H&H* 10.9, the couple act as slaves for the last time; slavery is mentioned three more times in book 10, none of them by Hysminias himself.<sup>263</sup> In book 11, the motif occurs only in the recapitulations<sup>264</sup> and is mentioned twice in the epilogue.<sup>265</sup>

<sup>261</sup> *H&H* 9.16.3; 9.16.4; 9.18.1; 9.19.1; 9.21.3; 9.22; 10.2.

<sup>262</sup> See also *H&H* 8.16.4 and 10.6.2–4.

<sup>263</sup> *H&H* 10.10.11; 10.10.12; 10.14.

<sup>264</sup> *H&H* 11.4.3; 11.5.1; 11.5.4; 11.7; 11.9.5; 11.10.2; 11.16.1.

<sup>265</sup> ὦ τύραννε Ἐρως, οὗ δοῦλος ἐξ Αὐλικώμιδος ταύτης εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἐπανήκον Εὐρύκωμιν, “o tyrant Eros, as whose slave I returned to my Eurykomis from Aulikomis” (*H&H* 11.20.1) and ἡμεῖς οὐκ αἰχμάλωτοι καὶ δοῦλοι καὶ πλανῆται, “were we not prisoners and slaves and vagabonds” (*H&H* 11.21.2).



Thus, through the double aspects of the slavery motif an analogy is made between the subjection to Eros and the subjection to human masters. The analogy does not necessarily entail that the literal bondage is a metaphor for Eros, but rather underlines the difference in the two situations: the protagonists may be saved from their masters, but they can never escape the servitude to Eros.<sup>266</sup> One of the reasons for their release is their background: they are freeborn Greeks, who cannot be held as slaves by other Greeks (*H&H* 10.14).

The references in *H&H* to Hellenes and Philhellenes<sup>267</sup> may be compared to those in Heliodoros,<sup>268</sup> but they probably also reflect the revival of Hellenism in the twelfth century.<sup>269</sup> Byzantine intellectuals, idealising the ancient Greeks as moral and noble models, were now prepared to call themselves Hellenes.<sup>270</sup> The contrasting of Hellenes and barbarians that we can see in *H&H*<sup>271</sup> was relevant to the twelfth-century audience (some of whom had experienced the cruelty of barbarians sacking cities), since it constituted an opposition to their own inherent superiority as Hellenes.<sup>272</sup> The references to Hellenism in *H&H* are thus an external element of the slavery motif.

The three motifs discussed here—the garden, dreaming, and slavery—are all closely linked together.<sup>273</sup> The dreams are engendered by things seen and events that have taken place in the garden, and Hysminias is enslaved to

---

<sup>266</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 57–59 and n. 33.

<sup>267</sup> *H&H* 8.9–8.10, 9.14.5, 10.10.12.

<sup>268</sup> *Aith.* 7.11.7 and 7.19.8.

<sup>269</sup> Alexiou (1977) 35; Macrides & Magdalino (1991) esp. 139–156.

<sup>270</sup> Macrides & Magdalino (1991) esp. 139–156 (pp. 148–152 on the novels).

<sup>271</sup> Greeks are contrasted to barbarians, primarily in the description of their actions (*H&H* 8.1–8.9), but also in the change of Hysminias' name into the barbarian Artakes (*H&H* 9.14.5). The name will be discussed below, pp. 158–159.

<sup>272</sup> Macrides & Magdalino (1991) 140. On barbarians in the Komnenian novels, see Jouanno (1992). Cf. Beaton's discussion on the relationship between past and present in the 12th-century novels. He argues that the revival of the genre added a new dimension to the "belatedness" of the ancient novels: the Komnenian authors recapture, in the fictional world of their novels, the world of the past in which the models were created; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 51–54. The Hellenism evoked by the texts is consciously both past and present: past for the purpose of discussing things such as the workings of Tyche in isolation from heavenly or earthly authority; contemporary for the purpose of giving order and meaning to certain human experiences that are always relevant—falling in love, separation, exile; Macrides & Magdalino (1991) 152. The Komnenian novels are thus a meeting place for ancient and Byzantine not only on a literary level.

<sup>273</sup> An important motif that has not been discussed here is the dinner/banquet; see below, p. 227, n. 282.

Eros in a dream. As free the protagonists meet in a garden; as slaves they are reunited in another garden; once again free they return to the first garden.

#### THEMES

Which themes do these motifs express? No one would question that love is the main theme in *H&H*, or in any other of the surviving ancient Greek or Byzantine novels, for that matter; it goes with the genre. In *H&H* there is, however, a strong connection with art: love as art, and art as love. The analogy between art and love is most explicit in the paintings of Eros and related subjects, and in the description of the garden that we discussed above.<sup>274</sup> The artistic aspects of love concern not only pictorial but also rhetorical art, as becomes apparent in the epilogue.<sup>275</sup> Eros is, of course, also one of the central motifs in *H&H*, expressed in passages such as the descriptions of Eros, or Eros' appearances in Hysminias' dreams. The motif of Eros has not been described separately here, since—as we have seen—it interacts intensely with the other motifs investigated; we have thus already gone through the majority of the important passages on Eros.<sup>276</sup> Here we will take a look at love in its more abstract aspect, most often expressed in the discussions between Hysminias and Kratisthenes.

Love is introduced in a humoristic manner by the end of book 1. Hysminias has told Kratisthenes of Hysmine's advances, whereupon the following discussion takes place:

Καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης 'τῆς εὐτυχίας' ἀνακέκραγε· 'παρθένος ἐρᾷ σου, καὶ παρθένος οὕτω καλῇ· σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀντερᾷς;' Ἐγὼ δὲ 'καὶ τί τοῦτο τὸ ἀντερᾶν;' εἶρηκα. 5 'Ὁ δὲ καὶ πάλιν [ὁ Κρατισθένης] μέγ' ἀνακέκραγεν 'Ἡράκλεις, τῆς ἀτοπίας, τῆς ἡλιθιότητος· ἀλλ' ἱλεώς σοι Ἔρως, μήτηρ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ ἱυγγες ἐρωτικάι.' Ἐγὼ δὲ 'τίνες οὗτοι' πρὸς τὸν Κρατισθένην φημί, 'τίς δέ μοι τούτων διδάσκαλος;' Ὁ δέ μοι φησι 'φύσιες ζώων ἀδίδακτοι.' Πάλιν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸν ὕπνον ἐτράπημεν. (*H&H* 1.14.4–5)

Kratisthenes shouted out, 'By all that is fortunate, the maiden is in love with you, and what a lovely maiden! Are you not in love with her too?' But I said, 'What do you mean by being in love too?' 5 And he shouted out again, 'By Heracles, what an idiot, what a dolt! May Eros and his mother Aphrodite and all the erotic charms be kind to you'. I said to Kratisthenes, 'Who are these? Who will instruct

<sup>274</sup> See above, pp. 97–103.

<sup>275</sup> See above, pp. 74–78. On the relation between art and rhetoric in Byzantium, see Maguire (1981a).

<sup>276</sup> Quoted above, pp. 103–106.



me in this?’ And he replied, ‘*Animal nature cannot be taught.*’<sup>277</sup> And with that we returned to slumber.

The next day they see the painting in the garden (2.2–10), and Kratisthenes explains to the confused Hysminias,

Καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης ‘οὐκέτι σοι τὰ τῶν ἐμῶν ἀμάρτυρα λόγων. Τίς Ἔρως ἡρώτας· ἰδοὺ μοι, βλέπεις αὐτόν· 2 ἀλλ’ εὐμενής σοι τὰ εἰς πείραν ἴκοιτο.’ Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν ‘σύ μοι τὰ περὶ τὴν γραφὴν φιλοσόφει καὶ τῇ γραφῇ προσάρμοττε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα.’ ὁ δὲ Κρατισθένης ‘ὁ Ἔρως γυμνός, ὀπλοφόρος, πυρφόρος, τοξότης, πτερωτός· 3 ὅπλα φέρει κατ’ ἀνδρῶν, πῦρ κατὰ γυναικῶν, τόξα κατὰ θηρῶν, κατὰ πτηνῶν τὸ πτερόν, τὴν γύμνωσιν κατὰ τῶν ἐν θαλάσῃ καὶ καθ’ ὅλης αὐτῆς· ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ, ὡς ὁράς, δουλεύει τῷ Ἐρωτι· αὐταὶ γὰρ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἷς σὺ θαυμάζεις ὁρῶν.’ Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κρατισθένην ‘μηδὲ γινώσκω μοι.’ (H&H 2.11)

And Kratisthenes said, ‘My words to you will no longer be unwitnessed. You were asking me who Eros is; now look—you can see him. 2 But may your experience of him be kindly.’ I replied to him, ‘Interpret the picture to me then and show how the epigram is relevant to it.’ Kratisthenes responded, ‘Eros is naked, he is armed, he carries fire, he is an archer, he is winged. 3 He wields his weapons against men, fire against women, bows against wild beasts, wings against birds, his nudity against the denizens of the sea and against it in its entirety. Day and night, as you see, serve Eros, for these are the women by whom you were amazed.’ I said to Kratisthenes, ‘May I never know him!’

Hysmine declares her love explicitly in 2.13.2 (although her behaviour has already revealed her feelings for Hysminias, and she has appeared before Eros in Hysminias’ dream): ὡς τὴν κλήσιν ἐκ τύχης, οὕτως ἐξ ἔρωτος τὴν πόσιν κοινοῦμαι σοι, “as I share your name through chance, so I share this drink with you through love.” Kratisthenes gives Hysminias another lesson in the end of book 2, telling him that he cannot escape Eros:

Καὶ ὁ Κρατισθένης, “Ἔρως ὅλην σοι τὴν παρθένον ἐξέκαυσεν, Ἔρως ἐτυράννησεν, ἐρώσης ταῦτα ψυχῆς καὶ γλώσσης πυρπολουμένης ἐξ ἔρωτος· σὺ δὲ μέχρι πότε λειποταξίου κριθήσῃ τῷ Ἐρωτι; 5 Ποῦ δὲ καὶ φύγῃς αὐτόν; Εἰς οὐρανόν; Ἀλλὰ φθάνει σε τῷ πτερῷ· εἰς θάλασσαν, ἀποδύσῃ δὲ τὸν χιτῶνα; Ὁ δὲ σου προαπεδύσατο· κατὰ γῆν; Τῷ τόξῳ σε φθάνει. 6 Εἶδες τὸν Ἐρωτα; Εἶδες τὸ πῦρ, τὰ τόξα, τὴν γύμνωσιν, τὸ πτερόν; Εἶτα σὺ μόνος ἐλεύθερος ἔρωτος; Σὺ μόνος;’ Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν ‘ἔα με σωφρονεῖν, ὡγαθέ· τοὺς γὰρ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς.’

Καὶ σιγήσαντες περὶ τὸν ὕπνον ἐτράπημεν. (H&H 2.14.4–6)

<sup>277</sup> Ironically, “you’re an animal, yet you want to be taught!” On this passage, see below, pp. 148, 257, 273.

Kratisthenes said, 'Eros has set this maiden upon fire for you; Eros has mastered her; her soul is in love and her tongue aflame with love. How long are you going to be judged a deserter of Eros? 5 Where will you escape him? In the sky? But he will reach you with his wings. In the sea? Will you strip off your tunic? But he has stripped himself off already. On land? But he will shoot you with his bow. 6 Have you seen Eros? Have you seen his fire, his bows, his nakedness, his wings? Are you alone free from love—you alone?' I said to Kratisthenes, 'Let me be chaste, my good friend, *for the gods love the chaste and hate evil men.*'

So we fell silent and gave ourselves up to slumber.

Hysminias suffers from the "Hippolytus syndrome", not so much from arrogance as from ignorance and innocence.<sup>278</sup> This is why enslavement is necessary, and Hysminias' "let me be chaste" provokes the dream of Eros in 3.1, followed by another discussion with Kratisthenes (3.3).

‘Ο δ’ οὐδὲν καινόν’ φησί ‘πέπουθας. 3 Ἐρᾶς οὐ μόνος, ἀλλὰ σὺν πολλοῖς βρωτῶν· καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἔρωτας εὐτυχεῖς, ἐρωμένην ἔχων οὕτω καλὴν καὶ ὄλην ἐρώσαν καὶ ὑπηρέτην τὸν Ἔρωτα. 4 Καλὸν δέ σοι καὶ ὕπνου τυχεῖν· ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ἐξ ἔρωτος ἀγρυπνήσας ἐλέγχει ψυχὴν ἐρώσαν· καὶ ὥσπερ γλῶσσα φιλοκέρτομος οὐκ οἶδε κρύπτειν μυστήριον, οὕτως ὀφθαλμὸς ὕπνου στερηθεὶς φαυλίζει τὸν ἔρωτα.’ (H&H 3.3.2–4)

‘What you have experienced’, he said, ‘is nothing out of the ordinary. 3 *You are in love, you are not alone in this but share the experience with many mortals.* And you are fortunate in matters of love, for your beloved is so beautiful and so completely responsive and you have Eros as your assistant. 4 It was good that you were able to sleep; for eyes that are wakeful from love reveal a soul that is in love, and just as a sarcastic tongue cannot keep a secret so eyes that are deprived of sleep discredit love.’

The adapted quotation from Euripides' *Hippolytus* in H&H 3.3.3<sup>279</sup> underlines the previous behaviour of Hysminias as resisting Eros. Now, however, he changes (see the dreams, esp. 3.4.2–3.7) and soon returns to the painting of Eros (3.8.2) to pronounce himself a slave. Kratisthenes reacts quite unexpectedly to this: instead of being happy that Hysminias has finally accepted Eros, he scolds him for having no respect for the Diasia or for his parents. His speech is ambivalent as far as love is concerned. In the first part he says, *μή μοι δύσερως εἴης. Καλὴ μὲν Ὑσμίνη καὶ λίαν καλὴ, καὶ νέμεσις οὐδεμία τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν*, “may you not be unlucky in love. Hysmine is lovely, indeed very lovely and *there is no wrong in suffering woes a long time for such a woman*”

<sup>278</sup> On ancient and Byzantine novel characters acting as Hippolytus, see Smith (1980) 546, n. 15; (1999) 178–179, 189–190, 191.

<sup>279</sup> Euripides, *Hippolytus* 439, *ἐρᾶς*—τί τοῦτο θαῦμα;—σὺν πολλοῖς βρωτῶν; see further below, p. 270 and n. 51.



(3.9.1–2), quoting the *Iliad* 3.157. This is to be followed, a little later, by a seemingly misogynistic passage, which is rare in *H&H*:

Οὐ νέκταρ Ὑσμίνη σοι κατεκέρασεν, οὐκ ἐξ Αὐλικώμιδος οἶνον, ἀλλ' οἶον  
Ἑλένης λαβικηδὲς φάρμακον. 6 Ἐπελάθου πατρός, μητρός, πατρίδος, ἡλικιω-  
τῶν, ἐταίρων, οὕτω λαμπρᾶς ἀγορᾶς καί, τὸ δὴ μείζον, ἱεροῦ Φιλίου Διός. ὦ  
πάντα κακαὶ γυναῖκες καὶ κατὰ τὸν σοφὸν  
ἔσθλ' ἀμηχανώτατοι,  
κακῶν δὲ πάντων τέκτονες σοφώτατοι. (*H&H* 3.9.5–6)

It was not nectar that Hysmine mixed for you, not wine from Aulikomis but a drug like Helen's that makes you forget. You have forgotten your father, mother, country, peers, companions, the brilliant company, and what is greatest, the temple of Zeus, god of friendship. O women, who are evil in every respect, and according to the wise man, *most incompetent in working good, and most skilled crafters of evil*.<sup>280</sup>

Why does Kratisthenes suddenly seem to discourage Hysminias? It seems to me that this is a test, an indication that Hysminias will have to learn to fight for love, which is part of the “education” that Kratisthenes takes him through. To contradict and to call in question is a maieutic technique, “reversed psychology” in modern terms, and the change should thus not be seen as an inconsistency in the portrayal of Kratisthenes.<sup>281</sup> As a helper character Kratisthenes is also responsible for the chastity of the protagonists and cannot encourage Hysminias to throw himself at Hysmine.<sup>282</sup>

Hysminias' “transformation into a lover” is completed in the next chapter (*H&H* 3.10.5). The change is emphasised in book 4: Hysminias readily flirts with Hysmine, and meets her in the garden, where she comments upon his change in behaviour (4.3.3) and tells him that she too will come to Eurykomis (4.3.4). Kratisthenes then shows him the next series of paintings on the garden walls: the pictures of the twelve months.

The description is long and very detailed, covering 12 chapters (4.5–16). The painting has an inscription, saying τοὺς ἀνδρας ἀθρῶν τὸν χρόνον βλέπεις ὅλον, “when you contemplate these men, you see the whole year” (4.17.2). There is in the description an equation of the sequence of the months with the progress from youth to age, which is implicit also in the iconographical tradition: March is a strong young warrior; February is an old

<sup>280</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Medea* 408–409.

<sup>281</sup> Cf. the elenctic dialectic in Plato's early Socratic dialogues, and also in the *Theaetetus*, where “maieutic” is playfully introduced. On the dialectics of Plato and the dialogue form, see Frede (1992); on the Socratic elenchus, Vlastos (1983).

<sup>282</sup> Cf. Bakhtin (1981) 106–108 on the ancient novel as *Prüfungsroman*. See also below, pp. 161–162, 256–258 on the helper function.

man.<sup>283</sup> The ekphrasis is followed by an interpretation (4.18) in which each month is identified, but without mentioning its name.<sup>284</sup> The two friends go to bed, but Hysminias cannot sleep and they have another discussion about the painting.

Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν ‘νῦν τὰς γραφὰς ὅλας ἀνεμετροῦμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς ἐρωῶμεν καὶ ταύτας ταῖς γραφαῖς προσηρμότομεν, καὶ θέρει μὲν καὶ ψύχει καὶ ἔαρι καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καιρὸς ἀφωσίωται, Ἐρως δ’ οὐ περιγέγραπται τῇ γραφῇ, οὐ πρὸς καιρὸν τῇ τέχνῃ μετεχρωμάσται· πάντως ὅτι παντὶ καιρῷ μεθαρμόζεται.’ 2 Ὁ δὲ Κρατισθένης ‘ἰσχυρῶς σε καταπαγιδεύω τοῖς χεῖλεσι καὶ τοῖς σοῖς τὴν νικῶσαν ἔχω προβλήμασιν· ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ καὶ ἀπαράγραπτος ὁ γραφεὺς· θέρει γὰρ καὶ ψύχει καὶ ἔαρι καιρὸς ἀφωσίωται κατὰ γε τὴν γραφὴν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν σόν, ἔρωτι δ’ οὐδαμῶς· 3 ἂν δ’ ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾷ, τυραννὶς τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἂν καταδυναστεύσας πολλὰκις ἐκράτησε παρ’ ἡμῖν, οὐ νόμος τὸ σπάνιον, ἡ γάρ τοι τοῦ ζωγράφου γραφὴς Ἐρμοῦ μοι ἀκόντιον, ὅλη κατεστομωμένη τοῖς ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων προβλήμασιν.’ 4 Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κρατισθένην ‘ἀλλ’ αὐταῖς σοι ταῖς τῶν χρωμάτων βαφαῖς ἐκθηλυθήσεται τὸ ἀκόντιον· Ἐρως γὰρ προγέγραπται βασιλεὺς, καὶ πᾶσα φύσις ἀνδρῶν ὡς δούλη παρίστατο, ἄνδρες δὲ πάντως καὶ οἷς ὁ γραφεὺς τοὺς καιροὺς μεθαρμόσατο· εἰ γοῦν τὸ πᾶν καὶ καθόλου δουλῶνται τῷ Ἐρωτι, πῶς τὸ μερικὸν ἐκφύγη τὴν δούλωσιν; 5 Εἰ δὲ καὶ πᾶν τμήμα καιροῦ καὶ διάστημα τὴν σύστασιν ἔσχηκεν ὡς ἐξ ὕλης ἐξ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, αὐταὶ δὲ δούλαι κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν καὶ τὸ σὸν μυσταγωγῆμα, εὐδελον ὡς καὶ τὸ ἐκ τούτων καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν καὶ<sup>285</sup> ὅλον ἐν ὅλαις αὐταῖς οὐκ ἀποφύγη τὴν δούλωσιν, ἀλλ’ ἄκον συνδουλαγωγηθήσεται.’ 6 Ταῦτ’ εἶπον, καὶ τὸν Κρατισθένην εὐθὺς κατεφίλησα ‘νικῶ σε’ λέγων ‘Κρατίσθηνες·’ ὁ δ’ ἔστω, νενίκησας· γενώμεθα περὶ τὸ δωμάτιον.’ (H&H 4.20)

I said to him, ‘We have now examined the paintings with our eyes, we have looked at their inscriptions and we have considered their appropriateness to the paintings, and a season was straightforwardly dedicated to summer and winter and spring and all of them. But Eros is not circumscribed by the painting, nor have his colours been changed by art to fit a season; indeed he is appropriate to every season.’ 2 Kratisthenes said, ‘I can ensnare you tightly through my lips, and I have the solution to your queries; for the painting is close by and the painter is impeccable. According to the painting and according to you, a season is dedicated to summer and winter and spring, but not in the least to Eros. 3 But if he oversteps

<sup>283</sup> According to Byzantine practice, following the Roman tradition, the calendar year started with March; see Stern (1955) 182; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 84.

<sup>284</sup> The ekphrasis can be compared to several examples of poems and ekphraseis of the months dating from the 12th to the 14th (or 15th) centuries, e.g. the poems of Prodomos and Manuel Philes, and the ekphrasis in *Livistros and Rhodamne*; all these texts are listed in Eideneier (1979). On the calendar tradition that goes back to antiquity, see Strzygowski (1888); Webster (1938); Stern (1955); Åkerström-Hougen (1974). On the ekphrasis in *H&H*, especially February, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 84–85.

<sup>285</sup> This καί is left out by Conca (1994a); I quote the passage as in Hilberg (1876).



the limits, that is a tyrannical action; if he becomes oppressive and often has control over us, the exception does not prove the rule, for the painter's brush, completely whetted by the paintings' queries, becomes Hermes' javelin for me.' 4 I said to Kratisthenes, 'But the javelin will be emasculated by the colours' hues. Eros has previously been painted as king, and all types of men were enslaved to him; but men are also those to whom months have been distributed by the painter. If everything is in complete servitude to Eros, how can a part escape that servitude? 5 And if every segment and period of time is composed from day or night as its primary matter, and these are in servitude according to the painting and your mystic guidance, it is quite clear that what is derived from them and through them and everything that is present in them cannot escape servitude but will be brought into servitude against their will.' 6 As I said this I promptly embraced Kratisthenes, saying, 'I have defeated you, Kratisthenes.' He said, 'Very well, you have won; now let us go to our room.'

The question that Hysminias wants to discuss is "where does Eros fit in?" Kratisthenes argues that Eros may not rule all the year around, because then he would act like a tyrant. Hysminias points out that all human things and everything that comes out of night and day must be slaves to Eros, and that Eros thus rules every season—this is why he has not been painted with any particular month.<sup>286</sup> Hysminias "wins" the discussion, and Kratisthenes agrees that he has been defeated. This must be seen in contrast to Hysminias' previous attempts at interpretations, which have not been very successful.<sup>287</sup> Now he wins for the first time, and in this respect too he is now an initiated lover.<sup>288</sup>

In all these discussions between Hysminias and Kratisthenes, we should note the formal aspect of the process that Hysminias goes through: the philosophical dialogue. The dialogue form has been inserted into and integrated with the narrative of the novel.<sup>289</sup> Whereas, as we have seen earlier, Charidoux functions as the pupil addressee,<sup>290</sup> Kratisthenes functions as the

---

<sup>286</sup> There may be a literary echo here of Plutarch's *De E apud Delphos*, esp. 388e–389c and 393a–c, where the proper periods and attributes of Apollo and Dionysus are discussed in a similar manner.

<sup>287</sup> *H&H* 2.7.5–2.8. Cf. also Hysminias' ignorance in *H&H* 1.14.4–5, 2.6.6; 2.11.3; 2.14.6.

<sup>288</sup> On the passage, see Cupane (2000) 46–47, who argues that the discussion reflects a non-Byzantine controversy reflecting Western motifs.

<sup>289</sup> Cf. above, pp. 52–53 on the philosophical essay, and also Halperin (1992) on dialogic vs. narrative form in Platonic dialogues, above all the *Symposium*, and Nicholson (2000) on the modes of discourse in the *Phaedrus*. Cf. also Agapitos (1991) on the so-called "discursive mode".

<sup>290</sup> See above, pp. 52–53, and below, p. 154.

dialogue partner and the exegete.<sup>291</sup> The exegete character appears also in the ancient novels, where explanations of ekphraseis are often required,<sup>292</sup> but allegorical paintings and stories as didactic tools had, in fact, long been used in the philosophical tradition.<sup>293</sup> Both the exegete and the addressee are important character functions also in a Byzantine context. In a dedicatory epigram to Manasses' novel-like *Chronography*, the author presents himself as an exegete of history to his addressee, the Sebastokratorissa Eirene.<sup>294</sup> The exegete's task here is primarily to transfer knowledge, *qua* artistic pleasure and understanding of higher thoughts. In *H&H*, the dialogues, and in particular the explanations and arguments provided by Kratisthenes, are prerequisites for Hysminias' change.<sup>295</sup>

The significance of *H&H* 4.20 is that love is linked to time, an important motif that we have not yet discussed. The motif of time brings to the fore the second main theme: development and maturity. The formal introduction of time may come in the ekphrasis and the following discussion in 4.5–18, but the importance of time for the development of love has been seen earlier. It took Hysminias two days and nights to fall in love with Hysmine, described in a slow tempo (Hysminias declares himself a slave in 3.8.3). The third night, the very night during which he sees the painting of the months, is even slower: dinner ends at 4.2.2, and Hysminias is woken up by Sostrhenes in 5.6.1. Time markers are frequent throughout the novel: smaller episodes are defined by the time to sleep, the time to eat or the time to sacrifice, and Hysminias in most cases mentions the number of days that pass between the different episodes. In the overall structure of the novel, time is emphasised in the couple's separation: they are separated approximately six days after their first meeting at the first day of the Diasia, and they meet at a festival which apparently takes place at the same time of the year, or a lit-

<sup>291</sup> Cf. in particular his Socratic behaviour in *H&H* 3.9 (discussed above, p. 126 and n. 281) and also Hysminias' comment on his "mystic guidance" in 4.20.5, discussed just above.

<sup>292</sup> On exegetic functions in the ancient novels, see Bartsch (1989) 36–39; Hunter (1983) 46–47 on Longus, where the author himself is the exegete of a series of paintings depicting the story he tells. The narrator is referred to as an interpreter also in the *Imagines* of "Philostratus the Elder"; *Imag.* 1, proem. 5.

<sup>293</sup> Hunter (1983) 46, with references in n. 90.

<sup>294</sup> Manasses, *Breviarium Chronicum* (Σύνοψις χρονική); on the dedicatory epigram, see Lampsidis (1996) xvii. On the exegete function in Manasses' *Ekphrasis of a palace mosaic*, see Mitsi & Agapitos (1991); full text in Lampsidis (1991). See also Agapitos (1999) 125–126, n. 76.

<sup>295</sup> See also below, pp. 161–162 on Kratisthenes' functions. On the dialogue form and its relation to *L&K* and the ancient tradition, see below, pp. 181–186.



the later. One may assume that they are separated for one year, the same amount of time that is indicated by the calendar on the garden wall. Development and maturity are underlined mainly by the progress of life that is implied in the ekphrasis of the months.<sup>296</sup> Furthermore, there is a connection made in the same passage between time and art.<sup>297</sup>

The ekphrasis of the months and its interpretation in *H&H* 4.20 are filled with artistic vocabulary and references to the artistry of the painter, which are linked to the art of rhetoric. References to art and the skills of the artist are frequent in *H&H*, which is partly due to the artistic devices of the ekphrasis. In books 1–3 the references are thus concentrated around the description of the painting.<sup>298</sup> The artist's talent is signalled at once: the garden wall πάντοθεν κατεχαριτοῦτο χειρὶ ζωγράφου σοφῇ, “was graced everywhere by the hand of a skilled painter” (2.1.2). His skills are frequently pointed out,<sup>299</sup> and after having seen the painting of the Virtues, Hysminias bursts out into praise,

Περιπτύσσομαί σου τὴν χεῖρα, γραφεῦ· ἀσπάζομαι τὴν γραφίδα· χάριν ὁμολογῶ σοι πρὸς γε τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅτι μὴ τῷ στεφάνῳ τῆς ὄντως παρθένου τὸ ῥόδον συνέπλεξας. Οὐδὲν κοινὸν σωφροσύνη καὶ ῥόδῳ (τῷ) αἰσχροῦς βαφέντι καὶ τῆς αἰδοῦς ἐρυθραινομένῳ τὸ πρόσωπον. (*H&H* 2.6.6)

I embrace your hand, painter; I kiss your brush; I thank you in addition that you did not weave a rose into the crown of this true maiden, for chastity has nothing in common with a rose, which is despicably dyed and whose countenance blushes red with shame.

After the Virtues, Eros is painted on his throne, and the first part of the description is interrupted by another enthusiastic outburst by Hysminias, this time followed by the interpretation by an Aristotelian maxim already quoted above: “*the vices are neighbours to the virtues and are annexed to them*. It is to this motto that the lad has been created, and art has brought the creation to life” (2.8.1).<sup>300</sup> Hysminias then continues with some bragging about his own exegetic talents:

Ἔχω σου, τεχνίτα, τὸ αἶνιγμα, ἔχω σου τὸ δῶμα· εἰς αὐτὸν σου βάπτω τὸν νοῦν· κἂν Σφίγξ γένη, Οἰδίπους ἐγώ· κἂν ὡς ἐκ Πυθικῆς ἐσχάρας καὶ τρίποδος

<sup>296</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 85, who interprets the ekphrasis as a warning that love is not invincible to time, an indication to Hysminias that he has to act and not just dream.

<sup>297</sup> Beaton, *ibid.* argues that time is a theme, and emphasises its relation to art as an important feature of *H&H*, 65–68 and 82–87.

<sup>298</sup> A few are not: *H&H* 1.5.7 (the fountain); 1.6.2 (the benches); 2.13.1 (chefs' skills); 3.6.3 (Hysmine's face).

<sup>299</sup> *H&H* 2.2.2; 2.2.6; 2.4.2; 2.5.1; 2.6.4; 2.6.5.

<sup>300</sup> See above, p. 104.

αἰνιγματωδῶς ἀποφοιβάξης λοξά, πρόσπολος ἐγώ σοι, καὶ διασαφῶ τὰ αἰνίγματα. (H&H 2.8.2)

I can grasp, craftsman, your riddle, I can grasp what you have done, I can immerse my mind in yours; even if you are the Sphinx, I am Oedipus; even if you utter prophecies from the Pythia's hearth and tripod, I am your priestly attendant and I can interpret your riddles.

We stated above that Hysminias misinterprets the painting, but the misinterpretation is significant as such: it emphasises the importance of a proper interpretation of the painting, and it stresses both the necessity of the reader's attention and that of Kratisthenes' presence as an exegete. When Hysminias sees what comes next, the throng of people and animals surrounding the king, he does not understand and he apparently gets scared. His fear is expressed in yet another comment upon the artist's skill: ὥς ἀληθῶς τέρας ἢ γραφή, νοῦ πλάσμα, καὶ χειρὸς ζωγράφου τεχνούργημα, "how truly marvellous is the painting, a creation of the mind, a masterpiece by the artist's hand" (H&H 2.10.4). And Hysminias will have to regret the first of his praises of the artist's skill (2.6.6), provoking Eros' wrath (3.1.3). He tries to "make up" by criticising—for the first and only time—the painter in 3.8.2: λοιδορῶ τὸν ζωγράφον ὅτι μὴ τὴν Ὑσμίνην τῷ χορῷ τῶν δούλων ἐγγράψαιτο, "I abused the painter because he had not drawn Hysmine in the procession of enslaved maidens." One must also note that the passage opens with another misunderstanding, namely that the painting "devises imaginary objects" and brings them to life only through its craft. Hysminias will soon enough find out that the powers of love are indeed real. He admits both mistakes in his final recapitulation (11.4.5).

We cannot dismiss the description of the Virtues as a mere prooemium to Eros; it has certainly been included for more particular reasons. The Virtues are depicted as four young maidens in a row, φρόνησις, ἰσχὺς, σωφροσύνη and θέμις; Prudence, Strength, Chastity (Sophrosyne) and Justice.<sup>301</sup> They are described in detail (H&H 2.2–5), and then analysed and identified according to their appearance and the inscription over their heads (2.6). The only one of the four maidens to be mentioned in the novel is Sophrosyne, but they all are important ingredients in the novel genre: these are the virtues needed by the hero and heroine of both ancient and Byzantine novels. Hysmine, in particular, is both clever, courageous and chaste, and in the end justice comes in to free her and Hysminias from slavery. Although Sophrosyne and Eros are opposed and contrasted to each other in H&H,

<sup>301</sup> On the Cardinal Virtues in the allegorical tradition, see Cupane (1974) 246, n. 15. See also Magdalino (1992) 199; Dostálová (1993) 51.



Sophrosyne is also an inner aspect of love. It is needed to endure the hardships of slavery, both to men and to love. For example, in 8.14.4, Hysminias is reminded by his new master that he needs to learn to be sober and chaste, just when we thought that he had abandoned Sophrosyne for Eros.<sup>302</sup> As we have seen, Hysmine and Hysminias carry both the rose and the laurel, the two symbols of love and chastity. Eros and Sophrosyne thus exist side by side in the novel, which is underlined not the least in the closing passage, the epilogue: “whatever is most responsive to passion in men, will appreciate the many passionate elements in the story; whatever is chaste and virginal, will respond to the chaste elements” (11.23.1).<sup>303</sup>

In this respect Hysminias is not completely mistaken in his interpretation of the painting (*H&H* 2.8.1): the juxtaposition of Sophrosyne as depicted next to Eros embodies a main theme of the novel, the innate problematics of love. Eros may not be evil, but he is indeed a tyrant. The very position of the Virtues before Eros enables the misinterpretation which emphasises and brings to the fore the very opposition; had the Virtues not opened the series, the contrast would not have come out the same. There are also oppositions within the passage, in the descriptions of the maidens.<sup>304</sup> Opposition is a recurrent feature in *H&H*: art and nature, free and slave, rose and laurel, vice and virtue, male and female.<sup>305</sup> All are closely tied together in the protagonists: they have the same name, but are male and female; they are free, but become slaves; they are virgins, but slaves to Eros, and so on.

We may compare this to the use of structural oppositions in a text from the eleventh century, the *Paideia Basilike*, an oration on the good ruler written by Theophylact of Ochrid to the young Constantine Doukas.<sup>306</sup> A sharp contrast between the good and the bad ruler (τύραννος and βασιλεύς) is achieved by placing them in the text next to each other, as in the Aristotelian maxim and as in the painting in *H&H*.<sup>307</sup> First the bad ruler is described (paragraphs 14–16), then the good.

<sup>302</sup> The passage is discussed above, p. 119.

<sup>303</sup> Quoted in Greek above, p. 76.

<sup>304</sup> *H&H* 2.2.2 (on fire and water), 2.2.3 (hail and coal), 2.3 (virgin and soldier, male and female), 2.6.3 (virgin and soldier).

<sup>305</sup> On structural oppositions in another Byzantine text, the *Digenes Akritas*, see Galatariotou (1987a).

<sup>306</sup> Theophylact of Ochrid, *Paideia Basilike* (Λόγος εἰς τὸν πορφυρογέννητον κῆρ Κωνσταντίνου), in Gautier (1980) 178–211. The oration can be dated to ca. 1085/1086.

<sup>307</sup> See above, pp. 104 and 130. Cf. also the technique used by Plutarch in the *symplokrisis* of his *Lives*, where the effect is achieved by contrasts rather than by resemblances; for a discussion, see Russell (1972) 110–115.

Εἶδες τὴν τυράννου μορφήν ὡς βδελυρά τε καὶ ἀποτρόπαιος. "Ὅρα λοιπὸν καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως κάλλος ὡς πολυπόθητον, ὡς ἐράσμιον ἄντικρυς, οἷον τὸ σόν, εἴ γε βούλοιο. Καίτοι τρόπον μὲν τινα καὶ τὸν βασιλέα ἐξωγράφισα οἷς ἐγραψά σοι τὸν τύραννον, καὶ γὰρ ἐναντίος ἂν εἴη ἐκείνῳ οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς, πλὴν ὀλίγα τινα προσεπιβαλὼν τούτῳ τῷ χρώματι.

You have seen how loathsome and repulsive the portrait of a tyrant is. See now how attractive and absolutely desirable is the beauty of the king—a beauty that could be yours, if you would so choose. In one way, I have already painted the king in the characteristics with which I depicted for you the tyrant, because the king would be his opposite. I will, however, add some strokes to the painting.<sup>308</sup>

First of all, we should note the way in which an artistic vocabulary is used when the author refers back to his own text: "I have already painted the king in the characteristics with which I depicted for you the tyrant" and "I will add some strokes to the painting." The writer thus describes himself as a painter. We may also note the contrast here between the tyrant and the emperor which in *H&H* is implied in the characterisation of Eros. Theophylact says that the characteristics of the two opposites are the same—the difference is a matter of proportion. One can, accordingly, describe opposites with the same characteristics, which explains how the ambiguity in the portrayal of Eros is achieved.<sup>309</sup>

The opposition between good and bad rulers is explicitly underlined also in one of Theophylact's probable sources, Synesios' oration *On Kingship*.<sup>310</sup>

ἄλλαι μὲν γὰρ ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς κακίαι γείτονες, καὶ ἀφ' ἐκάστης ὀλισθος οὐκ εἰς ἑτέραν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν γείτονα. βασιλεία δὲ τυραννὶς παροικεῖ, καὶ μάλα ἀγχίθυρος, καθάπερ ἀνδρεία μὲν θρασύτης, ἐλευθεριότητι δὲ ἀσωτία.

Some vices are neighbours of some virtues, others the neighbours of others, and each of them tends to slip not to another, but to the closest [i.e. from virtue to vice]. Tyranny is the neighbour of kingship, and is annexed to it, in the same way as over-boldness to bravery, wastefulness to generosity.<sup>311</sup>

Synesios alludes to the same Aristotelian tradition that Hysminias refers to in his misinterpretation of the painting, the same tradition according to

<sup>308</sup> *Paideia Basilike* 17, p. 199 in Gautier (1980); my own translation.

<sup>309</sup> Eros is both king/emperor and tyrant: in the painting he is depicted as *basileus*; in his actions he is a tyrant. In the discussion in *H&H* 4.20, the conclusion seems to imply that he is, after all, a good ruler; see e.g. 4.20.3: ἂν δ' ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πηδᾷ, τυραννὶς τὸ πᾶράγμα, "if he oversteps the limit, that is a tyrannical action."

<sup>310</sup> Synesios, *Peri Basileias* (Εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα περὶ βασιλείας) in Garzya (1989) 382–451. The oration was written for the emperor Arcadius ca. 400 AD. Cf. e.g. *Peri Basileias* 6a–b on the king as the shepherd of men with Theophylact's *Paideia Basilike* 25.

<sup>311</sup> Synesios, *Peri Basileias* 6c, p. 392 in Garzya (1989); my own translation.



which the structural opposition of the good and bad rulers was made by Theophylact. The three texts thus display a complex interaction: Makrembolites' portrayal of Eros and the Virtues, and the use of the Aristotelian maxim seems to refer back to both Synesios and Theophylact.<sup>312</sup> Texts such as these two make up the background against which Hysminias' interpretation of both the painting and the quotation must be seen and understood.

A main block of artistic references appears in and after the ekphrasis of the twelve months. The majority are part of the ekphrastic style,<sup>313</sup> and those that are most significant to us here are the comments on art in the discussion in *H&H* 4.20. Firstly, we should note the word-play of the passage, consisting of the repetition of *γραφή* in different forms; the same device has been used in other passages.<sup>314</sup> Secondly, the reference to the painter's authority in 4.20.2: "for the painting is close by and the painter is impeccable." Thirdly, the metaphor used to explain the painting's argumentative power: "the painter's brush becomes Hermes' javelin for me" (4.20.3).<sup>315</sup> Kratisthenes tries to use the painting as an argument, as he would have used words in the rhetorical field (Hermes' javelin as a symbol for the art of rhetoric). Hysminias, who has now understood the painting correctly, can also make the right use of this artistic kind of argument: the rhetorical javelin of Kratisthenes is emasculated by the painting itself, because we have it in black and white (or rather in glorious Technicolor) that everything is enslaved to Eros. The skills of the painter and the rhetorician are thus explicitly linked together, as they have been already in the ekphraseis.

Word-play on words related to *γράφω* extends even to the descriptions of the protagonists and their experiences. In *H&H* 5.18.1, Hysmine is referred to as a book, *ἐπὶ σοὶ βίβλω κατεμνήθην τὸν Ἔρωτα*, "you are the book by which I was dedicated to Eros." In 7.9.3, servitude to Eros is depicted as a written document, *Ἔρως ἡμᾶς ἀλλήλοις ἐδουλογράφησε [...]*. *Ποσειδῶν [...]* ὅλον δουλογραφεῖον ἐρωτικὸν ἐκπλύνει τοῖς κύμασιν, "Eros put us in servitude to each other [...]; Poseidon expunges every agreement of passionate servitude with his waves."<sup>316</sup> Literally, Poseidon

<sup>312</sup> Note, for example, also the use of *τρίδουλον* in Theophylact, *Paideia Basilike* 12. Cf. also above, p. 104, nn. 205–206 on Gregory of Nazianzos.

<sup>313</sup> So *H&H* 4.5.2; 4.5.3; 4.6.1; 4.6.2; 4.7.1; 4.7.3; 4.8.1; 4.8.2; 4.8.3; 4.10.1; 4.10.2; 4.11.1; 4.11.3; 4.12.3; 4.13.1; 4.14.1; 4.14.3; 4.15.1; 4.15.2; 4.16.1. On 4.13.3, see Plepelits (1989) 51.

<sup>314</sup> See e.g. *H&H* 3.8.3; 4.13.3; 5.8.2.

<sup>315</sup> Similar metaphors have already been used in *H&H* 2.3.3 (a spear as "Ares' pen"); 4.13.3 (the ox goad as "the farmer's pen").

<sup>316</sup> Cf. also above, p. 113.

washes out the words written in the *δουλογραφεῖον*, the document of slavery. In 9.22.1, Hysminias says to Hysmine: *σὴ γραφίδι δουλογραφοῦμαι [...] καί μοι τὸ δουλογραφεῖον γλυκύπικρον, ἀναπόνηπτον*, “with your pen I was inscribed as a slave [...] and that document is for me bittersweet, impossible to wash out.”<sup>317</sup>

After introducing the main themes of the novel—the problematics of love, the process of maturity and the nature of art—the paintings are only mentioned in recapitulations.<sup>318</sup> References to any kind of art recur only in the epilogue. Hysminias (the narrator, rather than Hysminias the protagonist) asks the gods to make his and Hysmine’s story imperishable in the stars, in the sea or in the plants, but concludes that they will not (*H&H* 11.21–22). Considering the previous paintings and the emphasis of the painter’s skill to represent reality, one would almost have expected Hysminias to ask the painter to make a representation of them, but instead he turns to the art of rhetoric: “our adventures will be set forth in imperishable tablets and slabs of adamant, with the pen and ink of Hermes and a tongue which breathes the fire of rhetoric” (11.22.4).<sup>319</sup> Rhetoric not only rivals, but replaces or even equals the art of painting, and the previous word-plays on *γραφή* will soon be explained in the concluding words of the novel: “we will grace this story and adorn this book with erotic charms [...]. And the title of this book will be ‘The adventures of Hysmine and of me, Hysminias’.” (11.23.3).<sup>320</sup>

A story may be expressed in words or in paintings, but it is still a story, and in this case it will also become a book. In *H&H*, writing and painting are equated.<sup>321</sup> The gradually evolving love story, engendered by the paintings in the garden, will thus be made eternal through the art of rhetoric. The novel’s three main themes—the problematics of love, the process of maturity and the nature of art—are all expressed *within* the garden motif, by means of the paintings. The ekphraseis must accordingly be understood as key passages to the thematic meaning of the novel. The themes are then explicitly tied together as the novel closes.

<sup>317</sup> The word *γλυκύπικρον*, “bittersweet”, derives from Sappho, fr. 130, and is a traditional epithet of Eros.

<sup>318</sup> And also in one remark by Hysminias in *H&H* 4.21.2 (love gives him winged feet, just like those the painter had given to Eros).

<sup>319</sup> Cf. above on *H&H* 5.18.1 (Hysmine as book) and 9.22.1 (Hysmine as pen).

<sup>320</sup> The whole passage is quoted above, pp. 75–76.

<sup>321</sup> Cf. also Prodromos’ dedicatory poem, esp. lines 6–14; Jeffreys (1998, 2000) and Agapitos (2000a). See above, p. 18.



In the first four chapters of this part of the study I have investigated the way in which the author has constructed the novel. We must now define *how* Makrembolites narrates the story, how he supplies the structural composition with certain technical devices. Genette calls this “narrating” (*narration*): “the producing narrative action and [...] the whole of the real or fictional situation in which the action takes place.”<sup>322</sup> The remaining chapters will concentrate on three technical sub-aspects: time and space, point of view and characterisation.

### 1.2.5 Time and space

A distinction is traditionally made between *narrative time* and *narrated time*,<sup>323</sup> of which the first indicates the time it takes to read a text, the second the temporal duration within the work, also called *fictional time*.<sup>324</sup> A narrative consists of a series of events and thus presupposes a succession in time: the events happen in a certain order during a certain period of time. There are two aspects to this: *temporality*, which concerns duration, and *chronology*, which concerns sequence, including interruption and parallelism. Duration is closely connected with the use of text-types that we have discussed above; the use of different kinds of discourse causes varying duration in a story, deciding the rhythm of the narrative. Chronology has been touched upon when we studied the repetitive scheme of *H&H*.

Bal makes a distinction between two basic kinds of stories depending on their duration, *crisis* and *development*, of which “the first term indicates a short span of time into which events have been compressed, the second a longer period of time which shows a development”; both forms may be distinguished within one text.<sup>325</sup> If we apply this distinction to *H&H*, we could term the first part (books 1–6) development, the middle part (books 7–9) crisis, and the last part (books 10–11) development. One may, however, note that on the emotional level of the hero-narrator, the entire narrative has to be considered a development, since the hero’s maturing process continues all through the novel, including the crisis period; it is during this period that

---

<sup>322</sup> Genette (1980) 27.

<sup>323</sup> Defined by Müller as *Erzählzeit* and *erzählte Zeit*; Müller’s studies on the concept of time were published in 1947–1955, then reprinted in Müller (1968). The relationship of narrative time to narrated time was picked up and developed by Genette (1980) 77–182 and (1988) 15–27.

<sup>324</sup> Mendilow (1952) 65–68. See also Tobin (1978) 3–28 on time as an organising principle in the novel.

<sup>325</sup> Bal (1985) 38–39; motivation of distinction in pp. 39–41; on the concept of time in general, see pp. 37–42.

the sub-plots appear, which is one of the diversions that serve to extend the time span of the crisis form.<sup>326</sup>

Alexiou pointed out the careful construction of time in *H&H*, and analysed it according to the principles suggested by Hägg in his study of the ancient novels.<sup>327</sup> Here we will be concerned mainly with fictional time, and with the use of time as a structural device. We will then move on to narrative space and the relation of spatial to temporal in Makrembolites' novel.<sup>328</sup>

#### FICTIONAL TIME

The total fictional time of *H&H* spans approximately one year, probably with the addition of a few days. The story begins and ends during a period in late February to early March, the time of Diasia:<sup>329</sup> the couple are separated on the sixth day after their first meeting on the first day of the Diasia; they meet on the first day of a feast of Apollo which takes place at about the same time or shortly after the Diasia. Time accordingly shows a cyclical feature. There are two breaks in fictional time, both in book 8 (*H&H* 8.8.2 and 8.16.1). Out of these ca. 370 days, 17 are covered by action.<sup>330</sup>

The days are often distributed in groups of three. The first three days are spent in Aulikomis where the couple fall in love. Another three days are spent in Eurykomis, and on the night of the third day the couple elope. Another three days are represented: the day of the sacrifice of Hysmine, the day of the capture of Hysminias by pirates and the day when the pirates sell their spoils in Artykomis. Then there is a break of one day before Hysminias arrives at Daphnepolis.<sup>331</sup> After another break of about one year,

<sup>326</sup> Bal (1985) 40.

<sup>327</sup> Alexiou (1971) 29–30; Hägg (1971a) 189–210, who applied the concept of Müller (1968) and Mendilow (1952). On narrative time in the ancient novels, see Lowe (2000) 240–245; on narrative time in the Palaiologan romances, see Agapitos (1991) 223–271.

<sup>328</sup> Cf. Nilsson (2000), which was my first draft of the thoughts that have been further developed in this chapter.

<sup>329</sup> See above, p. 48, n. 9.

<sup>330</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 29, who counts differently: “the first five books cover only four days and nights [...]. Two days and three nights are covered in Books VI and VII [...]. Book VIII continues with the eighth day, after which there is a break of three days indicating Hysminias' voyage with the pirates, and an account of the eleventh day. Then there is a substantial break in fictional time—probably a year [...]. Book IX covers three days, [...] and Books X and XI continue with an account of the remaining three days and nights. Thus, in eleven books, the principal action is distributed over no more than fourteen actual days, the total fictional time being about a year.”

<sup>331</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 29: “a break of three days indicating Hysminias' voyage with the pirates.” This is a matter of how we understand the Byzantines' inclusive counting:



Hysminias travels to Artykomis where he spends three days, after which he returns to Daphnepolis to spend another three days there. The last day, on which Hysmine is tested in the spring of Artemis in Artykomis, does not belong to any group of days. This day seems to be a somewhat “timeless” unit, a ritual turning-point at which the journey back to Aulikomis takes place, or at least begins, and the wheel has come full circle.

It is not possible to establish a precise chronology. For example, we do not know how long it takes to travel between Eurykomis and Aulikomis, since the narrator refers to these journeys in *ellipseis*. Nor do we know how long the last journey back to Aulikomis takes. We cannot decide whether coincidence in time is partial or complete: it may be that Hysmine arrived at Artykomis when Hysminias was passing through as a captive; if not, we do not know how many days later she arrived.<sup>332</sup> Vagueness of chronology may, however, be as significant as painstaking representation; the criss-crossing of two lines is enough to create parallel and suspense.<sup>333</sup> The omission of Hysmine’s adventures is brought to the fore in the latter part of the novel,<sup>334</sup> and it gains further significance when we find out that she has been in Artykomis all this time.

Almost all the action in the first part of the novel (books 1–6), which is either on an emotional level or concentrated in the dense descriptions of dreams or paintings, takes place at night, so that one could actually speak of groups of nights instead of days. The events of evenings (dinners) are often described in detail, followed by the dreams, meetings and discussions during the night. In books 9–10, when the first part of the story is partly repeated, the evenings and dinners are again emphasised, and it is at night that the couple are reunited with their parents. Most of the time markers are connected with evening and night-time: it is time to eat, time to drink, time to sleep, time to sacrifice (always at the third watch of the night), or time to wake up.<sup>335</sup>

---

Hysminias says that he arrives on the third day, which probably indicates what we would call “two days later”, i.e. only one day is not covered.

<sup>332</sup> Hysminias arrives at Artykomis the day after he was captured by the pirates, i.e. on the third day from the sacrifice of Hysmine. Hysmine says that she does not know for how long she waited at the beach (*H&H* 11.14.2), and then she spent one night on the first ship (11.15.1), one night on the second (11.15.5).

<sup>333</sup> Cf. Bal (1985) 41–42.

<sup>334</sup> Especially in *H&H* 11.11.1; see above, pp. 49–50, and below, pp. 246–248.

<sup>335</sup> Cf. Smith (1999) 181, and the surprisingly patronising comment: “[...] as is the case in *Hysmine and Hysminias*, where the hero does nothing but sleep and eat (the classicizing author not having a clear idea of the everyday life of a hero in antiquity).” Cf. Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 560–561, quoted above, p. 94, n. 163. It was not lack of historical knowledge that

Alexiou argued that the novel contains no abrupt changes of tempo and that "the main difference between the two parts of the romance lies in the type and density of the action." While books 1–5 concentrate on emotion and fantasy, the action—in its traditional sense—is condensed into books 6–11.<sup>336</sup> The type and density of action do, however, determine the tempo. In my view the change of tempo is rather abrupt, and the main difference between the first and the second parts of the novel lies in the choice of mode: narrative—diachronic—mode in the latter part contrasted with descriptive—synchronic—mode in the first. The apparently static and inactive descriptions in the first part of the novel are, in fact, dynamic and active at a closer look, since they are significant events themselves, which completely change the hero's life.

*H&H* does not contain much manipulated or reversed chronology; the story is told, principally, from beginning to end in the same order as that in which the events occurred. Exceptions are the recapitulations in the latter part of the novel.<sup>337</sup> But as we have seen earlier, there are a number of shorter retrospects inserted, and there is also the repetitive pattern in which words and formulas are systematically repeated, themes recalled, and events made to recur. This functions as a kind of internal system of reference, both as recapitulations and anticipations.<sup>338</sup> We noted above that there are two sub-plots in the novel, both involving the hero-narrator, and that the parallel experiences of the protagonists may be considered as a sub-line of the story.<sup>339</sup> The two parallel courses of events do not become explicit until the end of the novel, since Hysmine's story has been omitted. We may recall what was said above about omission of events: they are often brought to the fore in other parts of the text and thus gain power of signification.<sup>340</sup>

#### FICTIONAL SPACE

The concept of narrative space has attracted less attention than that of time. Space is, however, an important constituent of the narrative situation and

---

made Makrembolites introduce all the eating and sleeping; he used it as a structuring device; see above, pp. 94–96, 129–130.

<sup>336</sup> Alexiou (1977) 29–30.

<sup>337</sup> Hysminias: *H&H* 8.13, 9.13, 11.2–10; Hysmine: 11.13.16.

<sup>338</sup> See above, pp. 64–74; cf. Poljakova (1979) 106–109, who argues that the repetitive pattern strengthens the impression of the novel as an allegory of love.

<sup>339</sup> See above, p. 49; cf. Alexiou (1977) 32.

<sup>340</sup> Bal (1985) 41.



cannot be disregarded.<sup>341</sup> A distinction needs to be made between abstract spatial notions, such as narrative space in descriptive discourse, and concrete space, *location*.<sup>342</sup>

The events of a narrative happen somewhere, and that place, or location, created within the literary work we will call *fictional space*.<sup>343</sup> Fictional space may well be, and often is, geographically correct, but *H&H*, in contrast to the ancient novels, is enacted in a totally fictional world. The only historical places mentioned are Athens, Syria and the Rhine. Athens and the Rhine are not geographical indications, but places that are mentioned by the narrator as examples or analogues.<sup>344</sup> The mention of Syria is interesting (*H&H* 6.16.2), because it indicates that the world which Makrembolites describes is situated by a sea that borders upon Syria.<sup>345</sup> The couple, however, never arrive there. They travel between cities that are called Eurykomis, Aulikomis, Artykomis and Daphnepolis. The names of the cities are confusing, and the allegorical interpretation suggested by Plepelits, identifying them with real cities of the Byzantine world, is not convincing.<sup>346</sup> The setting, however fictitious, is the Hellenistic, pagan world of the ancient novels.<sup>347</sup> An allegorical reading is thus not necessary for an understanding of the fictional names as symbols—not symbols of real places, but of literary space in the ancient genre.<sup>348</sup> The reference to Syria and the possibility to sail there from Eurykomis indicate that the fictional space of Makrembolites exists in or parallel to that of the ancient novel.

<sup>341</sup> See e.g. the important study of Hoffmann (1978); for a briefer treatment, see Bal (1985) 93–99. On narrative space in the ancient novels, see Lowe (2000) 228–240; in the Palaiologan romances, see Agapitos (1991) 272–333 and (1999) esp. 116–118.

<sup>342</sup> Bal (1985) 43–45; cf. Agapitos (1991) 274.

<sup>343</sup> In analogy with fictional time, as above, pp. 136, 137–139.

<sup>344</sup> Athens in *H&H* 1.1.1; the Rhine in 8.7.1. On the mention of the Rhine as a reference to the river's particular characteristics, see Plepelits (1989) 189–190, n. 103; cf. Alexiou (1977) 30. According to Plepelits, the myth of the Rhine derives from the 4th century AD, and the epithet "Celtic" is known from the Imperial and Byzantine periods. Cf. *L&K* 8.12, 8.14 on Styx, and the myth of Arethusa told in 1.18.1–2.

<sup>345</sup> Cf. Poljakova (1979) 97.

<sup>346</sup> Plepelits (1989) 23–29 identifies Artykomis as Ephesos, Aulikomis as Constantinople, Daphnepolis as Antioch, and Eurykomis as Alexandria. Cf. Poljakova (1979) 90–91, 96–99, who understood the fictional landscape as an allegorical feature. See also Meunier (1991) 14–15 and (1998) on the external/geographical and internal/initiating journey in *H&H*.

<sup>347</sup> Cf. Poljakova (1979) 98–99, and also the references to Hellenes and Philhellenes above pp. 80–81.

<sup>348</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 30, who argued that the fictional names of the cities serve to increase the fairy-tale atmosphere of the novel. On the cities, see also Gigante (1960) 169; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 80.

The movement is cyclical.<sup>349</sup> The story begins and ends in the same place, the garden of Sosthenes in Aulikomis.<sup>350</sup> The central position of the garden, and the moving away from those familiar surroundings, underline the opposition to the surrounding world.<sup>351</sup> In this respect Aulikomis may represent the familiar court milieu of Constantinople, possibly hinted at by the name.<sup>352</sup> It is opposed to Eurykomis, which could then be seen as a symbol for the province or the surrounding world.<sup>353</sup>

Within the frame of the large geographical movement, shorter journeys are made: Eurykomis – Aulikomis – Eurykomis (books 1–6); Eurykomis – Artykomis – Daphnepolis (books 7–8); Daphnepolis – Artykomis – Daphnepolis, and finally back to Aulikomis (books 9–11).<sup>354</sup> We should note here how, in the second movement, the similarities of Eurykomis and Daphnepolis are brought in to emphasise the cyclical structure of the plot. There is, then, a cyclical structure as to both fictional time and fictional space in the novel.<sup>355</sup>

#### SPATIAL TIME AND TEMPORAL SPACE

An early study of the interaction of time and space in the novel is Bakhtin's analysis of the *chronotope*.<sup>356</sup> In the chronotope, Bakhtin wishes to grasp the connectedness of spatial and temporal relationships: the chronotope is the indissoluble unity of time and space.<sup>357</sup> In the ancient novel, for example, the chronotope is the "alien world in adventure-time", and in the novel's motif of meeting, time and space are inseparable, since coincidence in time and place is a prerequisite of the meeting.<sup>358</sup>

We have already discussed the notion of spatiality,<sup>359</sup> and mentioned the two ways to achieve spatial form that are relevant to us here: the network of recurrent motifs that delays the linear development of the story, and the

<sup>349</sup> Alexiou (1977) 30.

<sup>350</sup> Cf. Bal (1985) 96–97 and Agapitos (1991) 273–274. The garden *topos* is a central narrative space also in the ancient novel.

<sup>351</sup> The moving away from familiar surroundings is a theme also in the ancient novel.

<sup>352</sup> Cf. Plepelits (1989) 26–28.

<sup>353</sup> On fictional space and "the world out there" in *H&H*, see Beaton (2000).

<sup>354</sup> Cf. above, pp. 92–93 on the division of the novel into different parts.

<sup>355</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 30; Meunier (1991) 17–20.

<sup>356</sup> Bakhtin (1981) 84–258. See also above, p. 42.

<sup>357</sup> Ibid. 84.

<sup>358</sup> Ibid. 89–90; on the ancient novel, see pp. 86–110. Cf. Agapitos (1991) 226; MacAlister (1994b) 312. For an analysis of space in *H&H* with the use of the chronotope, see Beaton (2000).

<sup>359</sup> On Frank's concept of spatial form, see above, pp. 41–42; cf. Agapitos (1991) 272.



pattern of forward-and-backward moving in time that plays against the chronological development, such as recapitulation or anticipation.<sup>360</sup> We have seen a number of examples of spatialising devices in *H&H*, first of all the repetitive scheme of the novel, which concerns both the doubling of the story and the repetition with variation of several passages.<sup>361</sup> We also discussed parallel action, sub-lines and sub-plots, which all cause spatialisation.<sup>362</sup> In the investigation of motifs we noted how motifs recur in the novel and repeatedly express its main themes.<sup>363</sup> We have also analysed the descriptive discourse of *H&H*: the use of detailed scene, the ekphraseis, and the dreams, which all cause delay in time and thus spatialisation.<sup>364</sup>

One should, in a discussion of spatiotemporal aspects, keep in mind the dreams' somewhat strange status in a narrative: even if Hysminias, by telling the dreams in detail, in a way causes a delay in narrative time, it is also a fact that the dreams have taken place in fictional time, as has the telling of the dreams, and thus they are also temporal.<sup>365</sup> The two letters should also be mentioned here, yet another spatialising device that still has an extension in time. The letter that Hysminias receives in *H&H* 9.9 (revealing the story of Hysmine) has a repetitive as well as revelatory function: the maiden's rescue has already taken place, even though Hysminias is not informed until now. At the same time, as is the case with the dreams and the second letter (*H&H* 10.2), the letter has an extension in time since it takes time to read it, both for Hysminias and for the reader of the novel.

The pronounced spatial style of *H&H* is partly connected with the rhetorical tradition. Makrembolites' novel contains several types of discourse that are typical examples of progymnasmata, such as ekphrasis and ethopoeia. According to the definition made earlier, a spatialising device can be a type of discourse that delays the linear development of the story. In that case, both of these rhetorical exercises are spatial elements. The ekphrasis certainly causes retardation in the narrative, and it also brings in a wide range of connotations and allusions, which "spatialise" the reader's comprehension of the text. The ethopoeia is not in itself a spatial device, but when inserted into the novel it functions as a means of delaying the narrative. An

---

<sup>360</sup> Vidan (1981) 155.

<sup>361</sup> See above, pp. 56–74.

<sup>362</sup> See above, p. 49. Parallel action and contemporaneity of events are frequent in modern spatialising novels, for example in *Ulysses*; see Frank (1991) 16–21.

<sup>363</sup> See above, 1.2.4.

<sup>364</sup> See above, pp. 84–87.

<sup>365</sup> Although, in pp. 84–85 above, we considered dreams as part of the descriptive discourse.

example is Hysmine's story about what happened to her after the separation. As a rhetorical exercise this monologue would probably have the title: "What Hysmine would say when she was rescued by a dolphin after being thrown into the sea as a sacrifice to Poseidon"—but here, in the novel, the passage functions as a retardation, which, as mentioned earlier, is yet another spatial device. The text is virtually brimming with different kinds of rhetorical devices and word-plays. We should not call them spatial, at least not to the same degree as the discourses we just looked at, but it is a fact that every device that causes a delay, or keeps the reader in suspense, contributes to the overall spatialising style of a narrative.<sup>366</sup>

The distinctly spatial style of *H&H* is constantly opposed to and interacts with temporal narrative discourse. The author seems to be playing with spatial and temporal elements, and the interaction between the two is sometimes so intense that we in fact get an impression of *spatial time* and *temporal space*. A significant feature of the novel's strict composition is the way in which temporal and spatial components intersect without actually mixing. The distinct circular spatiotemporal structure is an excellent example of interaction between temporal and spatial components; a prerequisite of the closing of the spatial circles is the fact that time has passed, and the result is indeed an impression of space in time, or temporal space. Another example is the way in which the recapitulations in book 11 function as a means of delaying the chronological development, while one of them also causes spatialisation of the story by introducing parallel action (Hysmine's story). In the case of Hysminias' story, the chronological development has been delayed by means of repetition of an earlier episode, so that what we in fact have here is a narrative—usually conceived as temporal—component that spatialises the narrative.

A sign of the way in which temporal and spatial discourses have been contrasted to each other and played with is the change of tempo and mode in the second part of the novel. The first part is dominated by descriptive mode, while the second mainly consists of narrative. It is important to note that descriptive mode can indeed be active and implicitly eventful in that it

---

<sup>366</sup> Cf. Kazhdan & Constable (1982) 116, on the "Byzantine" style of Vladimir Nabokov: "yet another feature of Nabokov's technique that can be called Byzantine [besides the portrayal of the heroine and the literary puns] is the retardation of the narrative by means of scientific—mainly entomological and botanical—deviations, ekphraseis, or literary allusions." Nabokov displays an interesting link between Byzantine and Modernist literature: he was mentioned by John Barth in his essay on the literature of exhaustion (1967), and he displays a number of features that are typical of both Byzantine and Modernist style; see also Stark (1974) 1–10, 62–117.



can change the course of events or the life of the hero, and it may therefore be simplistic to say that the latter part of the novel is where the action takes place.<sup>367</sup>

There is also an overall spatiotemporal feature in the two novelistic *topoi* that form the very basis of *H&H*: the garden and the journey. The garden, the spatial *topos*, is the trigger for the temporal *topos*, the journey.<sup>368</sup> We have already seen how the themes of the novel are expressed within the garden motif, and how the painting of Eros effects Hysminias' falling in love and ultimately results in the elopement. When the temporal and spatial circles of the journey have been completed, it is in the garden that the couple are married and their love finally consummated. The most frequent use of descriptive discourse, and also examples of its carefully structured interaction with narrative discourse, are found in connection with the garden.

The spatial style of *H&H* accentuates the text's nature of work of art or artefact, particularly by means of experimenting with elaborated ekphraseis and dreams; spatial elements and devices contribute to making the text artful,<sup>369</sup> and probably also to the common assessment of the novel as artificial and laboured. The ekphrastic style sometimes has a function similar to that of allusions and quotations: the descriptions allude to and may lead to recognition of myths or clichés. One description can function as a means of recognition on different levels. The dolphin that saves Hysmine, for example, generates connotations such as the dolphin as a saviour in ancient myth and literature,<sup>370</sup> and Christ as the Saviour of Mankind.<sup>371</sup> In the novel itself, the dolphin also has certain erotic connotations both in itself as a "friendly beast", and in its relation to Eros.<sup>372</sup> A descriptive and spatial style thus

---

<sup>367</sup> Cf. above, p. 50 on the emotional action of the novel, and p. 142 on the significance of the ekphraseis.

<sup>368</sup> On the travel motif, see Adams (1983); in older literature esp. pp. 148–160. On travel as a narrative device in the ancient novel, see Lowe (2000) 227.

<sup>369</sup> On the composition of the artistic text, see above, p. 74, n. 72.

<sup>370</sup> Most notable is probably the story of Arion in Herodotus 1.23–24, but dolphins are mentioned frequently in ancient literature, e.g. in Plutarch, *Septem sapientium convivium* 160f–163d, and the same story in *De sollertia animalium* 984b–985c. In general dolphins in literature are very friendly, with the exception of the "pirate-dolphins" in *Hom. Hymn*. 7.53 (*To Dionysus*).

<sup>371</sup> The image is common in Christian iconography; see e.g. Wehrhahn-Stauch (1968). Plepelits (1989) 60, 67, argues that the story of Hysmine alludes to that of Jonah; Poljakova (1979) 118, argues that this "unmotivated event", along with several others, contributes to the "absurdity of the *siuzhet*", which in its turn contributes to the novel's allegorical style. She also points to its occurrence in hagiography; *ibid.* n. 19.

<sup>372</sup> On the dolphin passage, see also below, pp. 233–234.

makes the intertextual and referential system of mimesis even denser and more complex.

### 1.2.6 Point of view

The relation of the narrator to his work is a central problem of narrative analysis. It must be emphasised that we do not refer here to the historical author, but the fictional author as he appears in the text.<sup>373</sup> While the author of a play, for example, is absent from his work, the epic poet tells a story “as a professional story-teller, including his own comments within the poem, and giving the narration proper (as distinct from dialogue) in his own style.”<sup>374</sup> The same principles apply to an author of narrative prose. Another interesting aspect of a story is how it purports to exist: “some tales are elaborately introduced [...]: the story proper is given several degrees of detachment from its author or the reader by being represented as told A by B, or as a manuscript entrusted to A by B.”<sup>375</sup> Both of these questions concern what is most often referred to as *point of view*.

The concept of point of view has been subject to many discussions and studies in recent years. It has been argued that the term itself is too imprecise, since it does not cover all the relevant aspects.<sup>376</sup> In short, the terms “point of view” or “narrative perspective” do not make any distinction between *those who see* and *those who speak*.<sup>377</sup> In order to avoid this ambiguity, Genette introduced the notion of *focus* and *voice*, of which the first defines who sees, the second who speaks and also the relationships between narrating and narrative, narrating and story.<sup>378</sup>

<sup>373</sup> Cf. Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) esp. 70–76, 211–221 on the concept of the so-called implied author; cf. Chatman (1990) 74–108.

<sup>374</sup> Wellek & Warren (1963<sup>3</sup>) 222.

<sup>375</sup> Ibid. A problematic aspect of Wellek & Warren (1963<sup>3</sup>) is that it does not make any distinction between author and narrator; cf. Chatman (1990) chapters 5–7, 9.

<sup>376</sup> See e.g. Genette (1988) 188–89; Chatman (1990) 139. Booth (1988) 171–172 argues that in spite of the number of studies on narrative point of view—and his own of 1961 is indeed one of the most important and influential—the notion has proved less useful than expected, as they have been either too particular or too prescriptive.

<sup>377</sup> Bal (1985) 100–102.

<sup>378</sup> I.e. the act of narrating and the traces it imprints in the narrative as regards (a) time (the time of the act in relation to the events depicted), (b) narrative levels (extra-, intra-, and metadiegetic), (c) person (the relationships between the narrator, the narratee [extra- or homodiegetic] and the story); Genette (1980) 189–211 (focalisation), 212–262 (voice), and (1988) 72–83. For a criticism of Genette’s concept, see Bal (1983). On Genette’s terms “story”, “narrative” and “narrating”, see above, p. 47.



"Focus" and "focalisation" have frequently been employed to replace the term "point of view" in the last years.<sup>379</sup> I will, however, use "point of view" in its traditional sense, i.e. the perspective from which the reader or audience is allowed to watch the novel's action and characters. Since the person who sees and the person who speaks in *H&H* are one and the same—the hero-narrator Hysminias—there is no need to apply any further distinction. It may be argued that, when dealing with ancient or medieval literature, it is risky to speak of any technically conscious or intentional point of view, but irrespective of intention it is a fact that the reader is made to look at the action from a certain standpoint, and that this standpoint is determined by the author.<sup>380</sup>

A conspicuous trait of *H&H* is the consistent use of first-person narration. Alexiou pointed out that one of Makrembolites' innovations lies in this consistency of first-person viewpoint: there is no oral-epic introduction of the hero, but the novel is presented from beginning to end in the *ego* persona of Hysminias.<sup>381</sup> Even if, as in this case, a narrative is clearly presented by the hero-narrator, who is the only person to see and speak, the problem of point of view is not settled. Booth brings up the problems involved:

What kind of first person? How fully characterized? How much aware of himself as narrator? How reliable? How much confined to realistic inference; how privileged to go beyond realism? At what points shall he speak truth and at what point utter no judgement or even utter falsehood? These questions can be answered only by reference to the potentialities and necessities of particular works, not by reference to fiction in general, or the novel, or rules about point of view.<sup>382</sup>

Alexiou adopted Hägg's distinctions of different levels of first-person narration in the ancient novels,<sup>383</sup> and concluded that the viewpoint in *H&H* adheres to the second level: "the narration follows the registering of events in the ego mind, but direct speech and lengthy descriptions are freely admitted, so that the audience does not keep the narrative act constantly in mind."<sup>384</sup>

<sup>379</sup> See e.g. Bal (1985) 100–114, and Fusillo (1991).

<sup>380</sup> Cf. Hägg (1971a) 112.

<sup>381</sup> Alexiou (1977) 30; on point of view in *H&H*, see also Conca (1994b) 91–92.

<sup>382</sup> Booth (1983<sup>2</sup>) 165; cf. also *ibid.* 154–155: "the contrast between scene and summary, between showing and telling, is likely to be of little use until we specify the kind of narrator who is providing the scene or summary."

<sup>383</sup> Hägg (1971a) 127–28.

<sup>384</sup> Alexiou (1977) 31; Hägg (1971a) 127. Cf. Cohn (1978) 143–265, who introduces a number of more complex and subtle distinctions within first-person narration; see e.g. above, p. 81 and n. 105.

Alexiou argued that there is no parallel action in *H&H*, for which reason the need of recapitulations is reduced (only three relatively brief ones in the whole novel), and the treatment of character is consistent with the egocentric viewpoint—the characters are seen only through the eyes of Hysminias. She also stated that there is no sub-plot and no superfluous intrigue in the novel, though “in compensation for the lack of intrigue, there is considerable variation in levels of style—narrative, rhetorical laments, stylized ekphra-seis, and lively, stichomythic dialogues,” in which the use of prose puts the author at an advantage, allowing him to vary his style and language more easily.<sup>385</sup> I would like to add a few points, and also to discuss some of Alexiou’s arguments.

Point of view is essentially about selection, that is, what the author tells and how, or what he makes his characters tell and how. In the case of Makrembolites we have a story told by Hysminias, the hero-narrator, telling what he saw, heard and experienced during a certain period, closing with an “external” epilogue. No event or conversation which Hysminias did not either take part in himself or overhear is reported, and the paintings described in the ekphra-seis are seen by him. The feelings of the other characters are shown only in their outward appearance and in their direct speech (rather frequently recorded), but this account is of course given by Hysminias and is thus coloured by *his* feelings and reactions.

One of the advantages of first-person narration is the reader’s identification with one of the characters, forcing him to see the events of the story through the eyes of (most often) the protagonist. A change of the perspective would “spoil the illusion”, but the author of *H&H* does not; his viewpoint is carefully devised so as to be consistent. At no point of the story does the hero Hysminias have any kind of “authorial omniscience”, a feature occurring in the ancient novels.<sup>386</sup> On the contrary, the hero often suffers from *aporia*: he shows ignorance, makes mistakes and misinterpretations. We have discussed these traits earlier, and looked at the different passages in which this is expressed.<sup>387</sup> Instead of being confronted with an omniscient narrator, the reader is rather the person at advantage here. In *H&H* 1.14.4–5, for example, he can smile at (and with) Hysminias’ ignorance and innocence. There is, however, another side to this insecurity of the hero, namely that it may also affect the reader so that he loses his sense of security. In *H&H*

---

<sup>385</sup> Alexiou (1977) 32–33.

<sup>386</sup> Hägg (1971a) 112–13. See below, pp. 243–244, on authorial omniscience in the form of anticipating statements in *L&K*.

<sup>387</sup> See above, pp. 104–105, 123–128.



2.8, Hysminias' misinterpretation of the painting of the Virtues next to Eros, it is not only the hero himself that is thwarted, but also the reader. The author knows his audience and expects an interpretation according to the imperial and intellectual context, but takes on the right to reject it by means of Hysminias' misinterpretation, at which point the reader no longer is able to know where he stands.<sup>388</sup> The effect is tension and suspense, as the horizon of expectation is subverted.

Another means of creating tension for both the hero and the reader is irony.<sup>389</sup> In *H&H* irony is often of a metatextual character and connected with style, e.g. expressed by the insertion of quotations from or allusions to ancient literature as markers of a clashing or ironic situation.<sup>390</sup> An example is again the passage *H&H* 1.14.4–5: Kratisthenes' irony is expressed in the somewhat ambiguous, and manipulated, quotation from Hippocrates, φύσις ζῶων ἀδίδακτοι, literally "animal nature cannot be taught," but here in the sense "you're an animal, yet you want to be taught!"<sup>391</sup> Kratisthenes is the character who expresses irony most frequently, but also Hysmine has ironical traits, likewise expressed in ancient quotations. Significant is the dialogue between the protagonists in the end of book 9. Hysmine delivers a letter from Rhodope to Hysminias, whereupon he declares his love to Hysmine, underlining his suffering for love and implying that he will not accept Rhodope's advances. Hysmine scolds him and tells him to act wisely.

‘εἰ δ’ ἐξ ἐλευθέρων, εἰ δ’ ἐξ εὐτυχῶν, σῆς γλώσσης ἔσται τοῦτο λαλεῖν.  
‘Ροδόπη δὲ δεσπότης ἐμῇ καὶ σώζειν δυναμένη καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀποχαρί-  
σασθαι.’

23 Κὰ γὼ φημι πρὸς αὐτὴν ‘κᾶν φύσει τὸ θῆλυ θερμότερον, κᾶν φύσει  
τρεπτόν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν  
ὅταν ἐς εὐνὴν ἡδικημένον κυρῇ  
οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλη φρὴν μαιφονωτέρα.’

2 ‘Η δ’ ἀλλὰ μικρὸν ὑποσεσηρῦα τὴν παρειάν ‘μακάριόν μοι’ φησί ‘τὸ  
τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἄτρεπτον καὶ πρὸς ἔρωτος θέρμην ψυχρότερον.

Τί γάρ με λυπεῖ τοῦθ’, ὅταν λόγῳ θανῶν

<sup>388</sup> It should be noted that Byzantine texts in general demand security and order. On misinterpretation in the ancient novels, see Bartsch (1989) 80–108. On *H&H* 2.8, see above, pp. 104, 130–131, 132–134.

<sup>389</sup> On the concept of irony in literature, see Booth (1974).

<sup>390</sup> Cf. Alexiou (1977) 32–33. Irony is characteristic of any metacultural situation in which intertextuality plays an important role; cf. the ἀμφοτερογλωσσία, “double-tonguedness”, of rhetoric described by Tzetzes in his *Chiliads* 7, hist. 132, 295–301; p. 267 in Leone (1968); Roilos (2000) 109 and n. 1. On irony in 12th-century literature, see also Alexiou (1982/83).

<sup>391</sup> I.e. “it looks like I’ll have to teach you!” Cf. Hippocrates, *De Alimentis*, 39: φύσις πάντων ἀδίδακτοι. On the passage as a paraphrase of *L&K*, see below, p. 257.

ἔργοισι σωθῶ καὶ ἐνέγκωμαι κλέος.' (H&H 9.22.5–9.23)

'If you were free and fortunate, then you would be able to speak like this. But Rhodope is my mistress and can save us and grant us freedom'.

23 I said to her, 'Even if the female sex is more ardent, and more changeable by nature, nevertheless, as the tragedy says, *When she is wronged in the marriage bed, there is no mind more bloodthirsty.*' 2 Her cheeks quivered slightly as she said, 'Blessings on men's constancy and their cold good sense in the face of passion's fires. *Why should this upset me, when I die in word but am saved by deeds, and carry off the glory?*'

Hysminias quotes Euripides (*Medea* 265–266), criticising female nature; Hysmine answers him with the words of Sophocles (*Electra* 59–60), likewise criticising the other sex. We recognise here the juxtaposition of the opposite poles, male and female, from the overall structure that we have already discussed.<sup>392</sup>

But the dialogue between the protagonists also echoes a Byzantine literary legend: that of Kassia and Theophilos in the bride-show.<sup>393</sup> The story can be found in several Byzantine chronicles, and it runs as follows: Theophilos' stepmother Euphrosyne arranged a bride-show with beautiful girls from the empire, and the young emperor was given a golden apple to hand over to his favourite. Among the maidens was Kassia, the future nun and poet of hymns. When Theophilos made the remark *διὰ γυναικὸς ἐρρύη τὰ φαῦλα*, "From women comes all evil", she replied, *ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ γυναικὸς πηγάζει τὰ κρείττονα*, "But from women comes also all good." The emperor was hurt, turned away and gave his apple to another maiden, Theodora. Kassia founded a nunnery, led a philosophical and God-fearing life and composed many writings.<sup>394</sup> Theophilos' remark on the evil of women refers to original sin, whereas Kassia's answer alludes to the beneficial role of the Theotokos; there is probably a political standpoint here in the representation of Kassia as a female hero opposing heretical views.<sup>395</sup> What is significant in the passage in Makrembolites is the connection made between ancient and Byzantine: the Kassia legend is the Byzantine narrative setting against which the tragedy quotations are set *within* a novelistic context.<sup>396</sup>

<sup>392</sup> See above, pp. 131–132.

<sup>393</sup> On her name, Kassia, Eikasia or Ikasia, see Lauxtermann (1998) 394, n. 18; for recent discussions of the story and biography of Kassia, see *ibid.* and Kazhdan (1999) 315–326.

<sup>394</sup> For the sources, see Afinogenov (1997) and Lauxtermann (1998) 394, n. 17. On the Byzantine bride-shows, see e.g. Treadgold (1979) and Rydén (1985) for two opposite views.

<sup>395</sup> Lauxtermann (1998) 395.

<sup>396</sup> On female sarcasm in a novelistic context, see Kaimio (1995) 128 on Chariton.



As regards the reduced use of recapitulations, the absence of sub-plots and parallel action that Alexiou saw as connected with the egocentric viewpoint, we have already touched upon the issue in other sections. There are in fact a number of recapitulations in the novel, a few of them quite extensive.<sup>397</sup> We must also take into account the many repetitions with variations, doublings and paraphrases of passages, all contributing to the novel's internal reference system, which partly replaces the traditional recapitulations and anticipations.<sup>398</sup> We have noted the existing parallel action in *H&H*; the protagonists do live individual lives while they are separated, and Hysmine's experiences are not revealed to the reader until she tells them in her own words (*H&H* 11.13–16). We must note in this respect the necessity of Hysmine's story for a full narrative.<sup>399</sup>

We also mentioned the two sub-plots, both related to Hysminias and described from his perspective.<sup>400</sup> They develop in an unusual way, not introduced as stories in their own right, but gradually appearing through the reports of Hysminias. The episode of Rhodope falling in love with Hysminias is the most developed and detailed story of the two sub-plots (the first encounter in *H&H* 9.12; the last in 10.8). It is also related to the development of the couple's story, and it has immediate consequences for the relationship of Hysmine and Hysminias. Even without Rhodope's actions, the couple would, however, still be reunited; Rhodope could be removed from the plot without affecting the main story line, and therefore we can refer to this as a sub-plot.

From a narrative point of view, the second sub-plot is more interesting. The lovesick mistress of Hysminias, in contrast to Rhodope, does not affect the development of the story. She and her actions are briefly mentioned, but it is still possible to extract from the meagre information a full picture of the situation. The mistress appears for the first time in *H&H* 8.11.2, when she asks Hysminias to tell his story, the demand being repeated in 8.12.1, after which he engages in a recapitulation. She makes the following comment on his story: ὅλον δράμα τὰ κατὰ σὲ καὶ ὄντως τραγῶδημα· τὰ δ' εἰς δεσπότης ἡμᾶς εὐτυχεῖς, “your affairs are a play in themselves, a complete tragedy; but you are fortunate in this respect, that you have us for your masters” (8.14.1).<sup>401</sup> Hysminias answers with a quotation from Euripides (*He-*

<sup>397</sup> See above, p. 64.

<sup>398</sup> See above, pp. 64–74.

<sup>399</sup> See above, pp. 49–50, and below, pp. 246–248.

<sup>400</sup> See above, p. 49.

<sup>401</sup> Cf. Hysminias' comments when he is first asked to tell his story in *H&H* 8.11.2: τὰ δ' ἄλλα ζητοῦσα μαθεῖν ὅλον δράμα ζητεῖς καὶ ὅλον τραγῶδημα. Παράδειγμα

*cuba* 375), ὅστις γὰρ οὐκ εἴωθε γεύεσθαι κακῶν, φέρει μὲν, ἀλγεί δ' αὐχέν' ἐντιθεὶς ζυγῶ, "whoever is not accustomed to taste evil endures it, but suffers pain when the yoke is placed on his neck" (8.14.2).

The mistress' sexual harassment of Hysminias is then described in three passages. When she overhears Hysminias' laments she appears and offers herself as Hysmine: ἔχεις Ὑσμίνην ἐμέ, δέσποιναν σὴν καὶ δούλην ἐξ ἔρωτος, "you have me as your Hysmine, your mistress and your slave in passion" (*H&H* 8.16.4). With this starts a long and complex word-play on the opposition of slave and freeman that extends to all three passages. Hysminias refuses the woman—he does not even wish to describe all her advances, he says, lest his tongue or soul be corrupted (8.17). In book 10, however, he does describe the lusting mistress and the war between the two of them as he tries to pull away (10.6.2–4). The passage echoes the erotic strife between the protagonists (3.7.1–5) and between Eros and Zeus (3.2.3–7):

Ἄλλ' ἡ δεσπότης ἐφείλκετό με τοῦ χιτωνίου· ἐγὼ δ' ὁ δοῦλος οὐ μεθειλκόμεν ἐλκόμενος, ἀλλ' ὅλος ἀντέτεινον· καὶ ἦν ἀγὼν παρὰ δεσποίνῃ καὶ δούλῳ καινός· ὁ μὲν γὰρ δὴ δοῦλος ἐγὼ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐλευθέραν ἐφιλονείκουν τηρεῖν, ἡ δέ μου δεσπότης κατεδουλοῦτο τοῖς Ἐρωσι καὶ ὅλον ἀπεμπολῆσαι τὸ ἐλευθέριον ἤθελεν. (*H&H* 10.6.4)

But the mistress pulled me by the tunic and I, the slave, did not allow myself to be pulled along, despite being pulled, but I resisted completely. So there was a novel contest between mistress and slave. I, the slave, struggled to keep my chastity free while my mistress was enslaved to the Erotes and sought to dispose of her freedom.

The theme is further extended to the third passage (10.8), which has already been quoted above.<sup>402</sup> Another step of the mistress' intriguing is brought to the fore also in 8.20, when she tries to convince her husband not to bring Hysminias to Artykomis.

δοῦλος δ' οὗτος ἡμῶν, ὃν αἰχμή σοι καὶ γενναία χεὶρ ἐληίσατο, μή σοι συνέψοιτο πρὸς Ἀρτύκωμιν· δοκεῖ γάρ μοι καὶ τῷ νῶ συνετός, καὶ τῇ γλώσσει σοφὸς καὶ ὅλον συνέχων τὸ ἐπισκύνειον καὶ συνεχῶς θρηνῶν καὶ κοπτόμενος· δέδοικα γοῦν μή τί σοι νεανιεύσῃται τῶν οὐκ ἀγαθῶν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ δοῦλον τοῖς δεσπόταις πόλεμον·<sup>3</sup> καὶ ὁ δεσπότης φησὶν ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν χρηστοῖσι δούλοις ξυμφορὰ τὰ δεσποτῶν κακῶς πίτνυνται.'

Τύχης ἐγώ, νερτέρων σκιά, δαιμόνων παίγνιον. Ἐρινυνῶν τράπεζα, "when you ask to know more you are asking for a whole play, a complete tragedy. I am the exemplification of Fate, a ghost from the underworld, the plaything of the gods, the Erinnyes' banquet."

<sup>402</sup> See above, p. 121.



‘Ἡ δ’ ἄλλα “χρηστοῖσι” φησὶν ἡ τραγωδία· ὁ δὲ καὶ κήρυξ γεγονέναι τερατολογεῖ καὶ γένος καὶ πατρίδα λαμπρολογεῖ καὶ ἄλλ’ ἅττα πολλὰ καταγλωσσάγει.’ (*H&H* 8.20.2)

‘This slave of ours, whom your spear and noble hand has acquired, let him not go with you to Artykomis. For he seems to me to be intelligent and sensible in speech but he is always frowning and endlessly lamenting and beating his breast. I am afraid that he may take some impetuous action against you, since a slave is always hostile to his masters.’<sup>3</sup> My master said, ‘But, according to the tragedy, *Their masters’ misfortunes afflict good slaves deeply.*’ She responded, ‘But the tragedy said, *good slaves*, and this one has a tall tale about having been a herald, and boasts about his family and country, and goes on endlessly about all sorts of other marvels.’

This is the closest the mistress comes to affecting the plot. Her attempt is apparently a revenge for Hysminias’ refusals, and also a means of creating an opportunity to have him for herself while the husband is away. The author manages to create a sub-plot which is not a deviation from the narrative, but expressed in short inserted passages, and at the same time to draw a very unsympathetic picture of this woman.

We should note the many quotations from and references to tragedy in these passages. In *H&H* 8.14.1–2 Hysminias’ story is referred to as a tragedy, in response to which Hysminias quotes Euripides (*Hecuba* 375). The passage may be considered in relation to the dream sequence in 5.3.3–5.4, in which the tragic vocabulary enhances and reflects the evil of women.<sup>403</sup> We should also remember the misogynistic comments made by Kratisthenes (3.9.5–6), and the dialogue between Hysminias and Hysmine on male and female (9.23), in both of which passages lines from ancient tragedy were quoted. In 8.20 the mistress herself quotes Euripides (*Medea* 54–55). In 10.6.5, as a comment upon the mistress’ advances, Hysminias quotes Euripides’ *Hippolytus* (415–416; when his chastity is threatened, he returns to his “Hippolytan” behaviour.<sup>404</sup> The opposition between chastity and sexuality, in which evil women represent unchaste sex, is intertextually expressed by means of inserting quotations from tragedy into the narrative.<sup>405</sup>

#### THE NARRATING ACT

A number of expressions in *H&H* mark the narrative act itself. Besides the addressee Charidoux we find authorial commentary and exclamations that remind us of the narrating process. Authorial commentary is, of course, al-

<sup>403</sup> See below, pp. 283–284.

<sup>404</sup> Cf. also *H&H* 2.14.4; see above, p. 125.

<sup>405</sup> See further below, pp. 274–276, 284.

ways some kind of reminder of the narrator's existence,<sup>406</sup> but in a first-person narrative it does not always relate to the narrating act. For instance in *H&H* 1.8.1, καὶ τὰ περὶ τροφὰς καὶ τρυφὰς τί δεῖ κατὰ μέρος φιλοκρινεῖν; "what need is there for me to make careful distinctions over delicacies and delights?" marks that something which could have been told is left out in the narrative (ellipsis). In the same paragraph is one of the narrator's more common commentaries, relating to his personal opinions or feelings: οὕτω γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν ἐξ Αὐλικώμιδος οἶνον καλῶ, "for this is what I call the wine from Aulikomis" (1.8.4).<sup>407</sup>

Exclamations are also part of the narration, since they are "the re-experience in the narrator's memory of the actual situation". At the same time they are "a reproduction of the feelings of the hero at the time of the incident" and thus belong to the narrative material.<sup>408</sup> The most common exclamations in *H&H* are "by the gods," "by Zeus," and "by Eros," recalling recurrent motifs of the novel.<sup>409</sup> At dramatic moments other exclamations occur, such as the desperate cry of Hysminias when telling how Hysmine was thrown overboard: ἀλλὰ μή μοι τὸ τῶν ὀδόντων ἔρκος ἐκφύγῃς, ψυχῇ, "may you not, o soul, escape the barrier of my teeth!" (*H&H* 7.15.2).<sup>410</sup>

Devices like these, which "disclose" the narrator's "feelings", mimic a story *being told*, the actual narrating act.<sup>411</sup> At the same time they indicate the book "turned into rhetoric" that is referred to in the epilogue. The effect is pathetic: the reader gets the impression of an oral or epistolary personal account of a love-story. The function, in my view, is to create tension and suspense: when the distinction between the preservation of the story (to be depicted on a *stele*) and the book to be written (a golden statue of words) is introduced, the reader cannot be sure whether the narrative he just read was the mere story or the book embellished with rhetoric. The story's incon-

<sup>406</sup> On authorial commentary, see above, p. 87.

<sup>407</sup> Cf. Agapitos (1991) 76 on the so-called *interjection*, an authorial statement that denotes a direct appeal to the reader by referring to the narrator's "feelings".

<sup>408</sup> Hägg (1971a) 127. This is, however, not necessarily the case; an exclamation such as "God, I was stupid!" would be an exception.

<sup>409</sup> "by the gods" *H&H* 1.9.1, 3.4.1, 3.9.3, 4.2.3, 5.4.3, 5.11.5, 5.13.2, 6.3.1, 9.4.1, 10.6.3, 11.12.4; "by Eros" 3.4.1, 3.4.7, 3.5.2 ("by Eros of the dreams"), 3.7.6, 3.7.7, 3.9.4, 5.11.4, 7.7.2, 11.19.4; "by Zeus" 1.7.1, 3.9.3, 5.20.2. Note the extremely frequent use of Eros in book 3, with the enslavement of Hysminias. Zeus loses importance (power) in the course of the novel.

<sup>410</sup> Cf. *Il.* 9.409. See below, p. 218, on the Byzantine use of Homeric quotations to signal a dramatic episode.

<sup>411</sup> Authorial interjections are, however, well established in the rhetorical tradition and do not reflect emotional reality in psychological terms; Agapitos (1991) 76. Cf. also Meunier (1991) 20–21.



gruity with the closure is striking: the later generation which is called upon in the epilogue is Makrembolites the author, which means that the reader has been thwarted—there is no author yet! The conspicuous contrast is that between the present situation, the narrative, and the later situation as an opening of the same narrative.

We must accordingly distinguish the experiencing Hysminias both from the author of the book and from the narrator of the epilogue, since, in the epilogue, the narrator steps out of his character Hysminias and addresses someone of a later generation.<sup>412</sup> It may seem a logical consequence to claim that the addressee Charidoux is the author, since he seems to be the person to whom Hysminias tells his story.<sup>413</sup> Charidoux is, however, the fictional listener, which does not prove that he is either the historical or the fictional author.<sup>414</sup> Makrembolites plays with the forms of the ancient novel and the philosophical dialogue, and the result is rhetoric imbued by pathos. Charidoux is the pupil addressee of the philosophical dialogue and as such part of the narrative situation, in contrast to the *later* generation who will compose and enjoy the book. It is possible that Charidoux in the contemporary context alluded to Makrembolites' patron, as part of the overall intellectual plays going on in the court milieu.<sup>415</sup> It is, however, not my task here to try to identify him, nor is it probable that his name can be extracted from that of Charidoux—for an addressee of a text filled with *charis* Charidoux indeed seems a suitable name.

### 1.2.7 Characterisation

A character is an "actor" in a story, provided with distinctive characteristics. E. M. Forster made a distinction between round characters, which are complex and dynamic, and undergo some change in the course of the story, and flat characters, which are stable and stereotypical, and never surprise the reader.<sup>416</sup> The construction of character is often more complicated than that. There are, according to Bal, four important principles of the construction of the image of a character: (a) repetition, (b) accumulation of character-

---

<sup>412</sup> On this, see above, p. 76.

<sup>413</sup> See Plepelits (1989) 1–6, who argues that the historical author of *H&H* can be deciphered from the pseudonym Charidoux; see above, p. 17 and n. 36.

<sup>414</sup> Note that this is not an equivalent to the implied author; cf. above, p. 145 and n. 373.

<sup>415</sup> See above, p. 33 on the 12th-century court milieu and patronage.

<sup>416</sup> Forster (1927) 43–79, of which an excerpt is reprinted in Hoffmann & Murphy (1988) 40–47; cf. Bal (1985) 80–82 on the problems of characterisation.

istics, (c) relations, (d) change.<sup>417</sup> These are the devices according to which the reader forms his image of a character in a narrative. A simple form of characterisation is naming.<sup>418</sup> The name of a character supplies the reader with certain information: first of all gender, sometimes also geographical origin and/or social status. Names may also be motivated and have a bearing upon the character's characteristics.<sup>419</sup>

Characterisation cannot be considered in isolation. It is useful to note how the point of view chosen by the author, and its different levels, determine the reader's conception of the story and its characters. Also, the abundance of descriptive detail that makes the portrayals vivid—or the absence of it—influences the reader, as well as the narrator's rhetorical technique, as he shifts from one stylistic level to another in the dialogues or monologues. The portrayal of a character is accordingly also the result of a co-operation between text and reader.<sup>420</sup>

Genre also plays a part in characterisation, particularly as regards a character's predictability.<sup>421</sup> In the ancient and Byzantine novel, for example, we find a number of stereotypes and so-called *referential characters*: the good friend and helper, the bad pirate or robber who threatens the heroine's chastity, etc.<sup>422</sup> This does not, however, mean that all characters of ancient and Byzantine novels are entirely stereotypically constructed. It is of significance to consider the individual characters and examine which principles are used in their construction. It is also important to study characterisation in *H&H* for the simple reason that its characters have traditionally been seen as completely stereotypical and without individuality.<sup>423</sup>

#### NAMING OF CHARACTERS

It has been noticed by many readers that some of the names of the characters in *H&H* are confusingly similar to those in *L&K*. The named characters are Hysminias and his parents Themisteus and Dianteia, Hysmine and her

<sup>417</sup> Bal (1985) 85–86.

<sup>418</sup> According to Wellek & Warren (1963<sup>3</sup>) 219 even the "simplest form of characterisation".

<sup>419</sup> Bal (1985) 84.

<sup>420</sup> See e.g. Hamon (1977).

<sup>421</sup> Bal (1985) 83–84.

<sup>422</sup> For the term referential characters, see Bal (1985) 83. On characters in the ancient novel, see Billault (1991) 121–189 and (1996); Létoublon (1993) 80–105. See also below, p. 249.

<sup>423</sup> See e.g. Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 560, but note especially Poljakova (1979) pp. 91–96. Attitudes are slowly changing; see e.g. Ruas in Zimmermann, Panayiotakis & Keulen (2000) 98–99.



parents Sosthenes and Panthia, Hysminias' friend Kratisthenes, Hysmine's master Sostratos and his daughter Rhodope; unnamed characters are the captain, Hysminias' master and mistress, the priest of Apollo.<sup>424</sup> The names that are drawn from *L&K* are those of characters that are related to the heroine: the parents of Hysmine are called Sosthenes and Panthia, those of Leukippe are Sostratos and Pantheia; Hysmine's master is called Sostratos, Leukippe's Sosthenes. It is also possible that the name of Hysmine's mistress Rhodope has been drawn from or is hinting at Rhodopis in *L&K* 8.12. The names from *L&K* in *H&H* thus specifically link the heroines of the two novels together, not the entire set of characters.

Makrembolites' reuse of some of Tatius' names has invited the definition of *H&H* as a mechanical imitation of *L&K*. However, names are only one aspect of characterisation, and characterisation is only one aspect of a narrative—the reuse of names is thus not a very good argument for the text as pure imitation. Furthermore, there is no direct allusion in *H&H* to the names of the protagonists of *L&K*. If Makrembolites wrote an imitation in its proper sense, would one not expect such references? Names are probably part of the novel genre, and may as such be drawn freely without necessary allusions. For example, the name Kratisthenes may have some bearing upon Kallisthenes in *L&K*, but in that case the resemblance does not allude to their characteristics since they have nothing in common. Likewise, the name of Hysminias' father Themisteus is found in Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe*, but there do not seem to be any relations in the portrayal of the father to that of Longus' character. What is significant in Makrembolites' adoption of names from *L&K* is that they all are given to people who are in some way related to Hysmine.<sup>425</sup>

Hysmine and Hysminias share "the same name", a fact that links them literally to each other. The similarity is pointed out by Hysmine the first time they meet: ἔχεις [...] ἐξ ὁμωνύμου παρθένου τὴν κύλικα, "you are receiving the cup from a maiden with the same name" (*H&H* 1.9.1). At the second dinner she greets Hysminias as her namesake: χαίροις, συνώνυμέ μοι κήρυξ, "welcome, herald with the same name as mine" (2.12.2). At the end of the same dinner she whispers ὡς τὴν κλησιν ἐξ τύχης, οὕτως ἐξ ἔρωτος τὴν πόσιν κοινοῦμαί σοι, "as I share your name through chance,

<sup>424</sup> Plepelits (1989) 19 argues that another named character exists, a Kallisthenes (*H&H* 5.10.3). This is based on a conjecture made by Philippe LeBas in 1856. Plepelits' arguments are not convincing; there is, in my view, no reason to suspect that the character here is someone else than Kratisthenes.

<sup>425</sup> Particularly interesting is the use of the similar names of Pantheia and Panthia; see below, pp. 224–227, 283–286.

so I share this drink with you through love" (2.13.2). Each of her lines is repeated by Hysminias in his recapitulations to Kratisthenes (1.14.1; 2.14.2; 2.14.3). The manuscripts differ in the spelling of the names, but they all are pronounced in the same way: "Ismini" and "Isminias".<sup>426</sup> The question may be raised whether these names have a bearing upon the characters, if they are motivated.

Some widely differing suggestions have been made. The epic word ὕσμινη means a fight or battle, which for *H&H* has been interpreted as both the physical combat between man and woman,<sup>427</sup> and as perseverance and patience, i.e. chastity.<sup>428</sup> It may well be so,<sup>429</sup> but the significance, in my view, lies in the similarity between their names, the *homonymity*.<sup>430</sup> It is emphasised in the passages quoted above, and given further significance through Hysminias' repetition almost word by word. According to Hysmine, the names are shared through Tyche (*H&H* 2.13.2), a fact that justifies their relationship and her advances, since their love is then determined by Fate.<sup>431</sup> I believe that there is a parallel here to the Platonic myth told by Aristophanes in the *Symposium*: man's well-known search for his other half.<sup>432</sup> Considering the links to the philosophical dialogue and to *L&K*, which alludes more than once to Platonic works, this seems to me a plausible explanation.

The words related to homonymity are repeated also in other parts of the novel. In the myth of Apollo and Daphne (*H&H* 8.18), homonymity plays an important part and the word "homonymous" is also here thrice re-

<sup>426</sup> Ὑσμιν-, Ὑσμην-, Ἰσμιν-, Ἰσμην-, Ἰσμιν-, Ἰσμην-; on the different spellings and meanings of the names, see Plepelits (1989) 21–23.

<sup>427</sup> The suggestion was presented by Vitor Ruas at the ICAN 2000: "the names evoke a body-to-body combat between man and woman, thus alluding to love fight." I would like to thank Mr Ruas for providing me with a copy of his paper and allowing me to quote from it. On the name of Hysmine, see also Agapitos & Smith (1992) 82, n. 208 on the 1989 edition of Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 78–79; Beaton's rather imaginative interpretation was, however, removed from the second edition.

<sup>428</sup> Plepelits (1989) 23.

<sup>429</sup> Uncommon names are indeed more often significant than common ones; see Plepelits (1989) 20, quoting Hägg (1971b) 56.

<sup>430</sup> Meunier (1991) 1 underlines this in her choice of the title *Les Amours Homonymes*, which she finds "plus conforme à l'esprit du texte".

<sup>431</sup> Cf. Meunier (1991) 24: "l'identité de leur nom les prédestine l'un à l'autre."

<sup>432</sup> Plato, *Symposium* 189c–193d. Cf. Poljakova (1979) 92, who argues that the protagonists have the same name since they embody the concept of love, and also Meunier (1991) 36: "le couple Hysminè-Hysminias [...] incarne l'Amour."



peated.<sup>433</sup> Homonymity is also implied and mentioned in the epilogue, where it is tied to immortality:

Σὺ δ', ὦ Γῆ μήτηρ, εἰ τὴν Δάφνην φεύγουσαν ἐλεεῖς καὶ κρύπτεις καὶ σώξεις  
καὶ φυτὸν ὁμώνυμον αὐτομάτως γεννᾷς εἰς μνήμης συντήρησιν, εἰ τὸν Ὑάκιν-  
θον ἐξ ὁμώνυμου φυτοῦ φυλάττεις ἀθάνατον. 2 ἡμῖν οὐ συντηρήσεις τὴν μνή-  
μην, φυτὰ δ' οὐκ ἀναδώσεις ὁμώνυμα στήλας ἀθανάτους τῶν καθ' Ὑσμίνην  
ταύτην καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ, ὅλον δράμα τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῖς φυτοῖς κατα-  
ζωγραφοῦσα καὶ καταστηλιτεύουσα καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς φυλάττουσα τὴν μνή-  
μην ἀθάνατον; (*H&H* 11.22.1–2)

You mother Earth, if you had pity on Daphne in her flight, and concealed her and saved her and brought forth spontaneously a plant of the same name to preserve her memory, if you made Hyacinth immortal through the plant of the same name, 2 will you not preserve our memory? Will you not grant us plants of the same name, imperishable figures of the perils that befell Hysmine and myself, Hysminias, depicting and figuring in the plants all that happened to us and keeping our memory immortal for those that come after?

By tying the homonymity of the protagonists to the making of homonymous plants (or, as in the previous chapter 11.21, stars or oceans) the author combines elements that are already double by nature in an elaborate amplification. He thus extends his overall play with repetitions and doublings even further.<sup>434</sup>

The significance of the couple's homonymity is emphasised when Hysminias announces that his name has been taken away from him.

οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' αὐτῆς ἐφείσατό μοι τῆς κλήσεως, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐξ ἐλευθέρου δοῦλον  
εἰργάσατο καὶ τὸ πικρὸν τῆς δουλείας τοῦ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀντέδωκε μέλιτος  
καὶ σκότος φωτὸς ἀντειστήγαγεν, οὕτω καὶ κλήσεως Ἑλληνικῆς βαρβαρικὴν  
μοι κλήσιν ἀντεπιτέθεικεν, Ἀρτάκην ἀνθ' Ὑσμινίου μετακαλέσαν με· καὶ νῦν  
δοῦλός εἰμι καὶ κλήσει καὶ πράγματι. (*H&H* 9.14.5)

The divine power<sup>435</sup> has not spared even my name, but when he made me a slave instead of being a free man and replaced the honey of freedom with the bitterness of slavery and brought darkness in place of light, he also replaced my Greek name

<sup>433</sup> The myth will be discussed below, pp. 231–233.

<sup>434</sup> Meunier (1991) 28–32 argues that there is a symmetrical character system in *H&H* in which all the characters have doublets: Kratisthenes, for example, is the doublet of Hysminias, and Rhodope the doublet of Hysmine. I am not convinced by the figure presented by Meunier (*ibid.* 31), although I fully agree that Makrembolites' novel is to a certain degree symmetrically constructed. That construction is, however, not consistently carried out, and the attempt to see a fully coherent system in all its different aspects is one-sided; the text has more to offer. Does not the question-mark in Meunier's figure, representing the non-existent mother of Rhodope, prove exactly this?

<sup>435</sup> The subject is τὸ δαιμόνιον from the previous sentence.

with a barbarian one, and called me Artakes instead of Hysminias. So now I am slave, both in name and in deed.

The removal of Hysminias' real name obviously marks the loss of his most important property, his freedom. Although the name Artakes is not found in Greek literature, the stem *Arta-* most certainly sounds Persian to a Greek ear.<sup>436</sup> The name itself does not necessarily have any definite meaning; the importance here is that it is foreign and strange and thus emphasises the "normality" of Hysminias' real name and, above all, its innate connection with Hysmine and freedom.

#### REPETITION, REACTION, ACCUMULATION OR CHANGE?

The hero-narrator Hysminias goes through a change in the first part of the novel, a *metabole* from chaste to loving, from *Sophrosyne* to *Eros*. The process has been described above, so I will not go into detail here.<sup>437</sup> We may recall that the change took place in book 3, triggered by the dream in *H&H* 3.1. Thanks to the first-person viewpoint, all Hysminias' feelings, thoughts and reactions are set before the reader, which makes it easy to follow the changes as the narrator sees them in retrospect. The principle used to construct his character, besides that of change, is repetition. Each experience of Hysminias in the first part of the novel (the part in which the change takes place) is reported and then reported once again to and discussed with *Kratisthenes*.<sup>438</sup> We may note that psychological character development is often considered a realistic and thus modern phenomenon.<sup>439</sup>

Hysmine is the only character to be depicted in any detail, the focus of Hysminias' attention being constantly on her even when they are separated.

---

<sup>436</sup> There are also a couple of variants in the MSS: *Atrakes* and *Athrakes*; *Plepelits* (1989) 23. The name is not found in Greek literature, but cf. *Arsake* in the *Aithiopika*, and in *Prodromos' R&D* 4.9 *Artaxanes*, and in 5.479 *Artapes*.

<sup>437</sup> See above, pp. 103–108, 123–128.

<sup>438</sup> See above, p. 63.

<sup>439</sup> See e.g. Scholes & Kellogg (1966) 165–169. *Psellos' Chronography* (or *Historia Syntomos*) is, however, known for its careful and psychological portrayal. On the concept of realism in literature and scholarship, see above, p. 91, nn. 142–143. We may compare the character development of Hysminias to, on the one hand, Hunger's (1980) comments on realism in the Komnenian novels and, on the other, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 53, who writes that "no amount of special pleading can make a real case for their originality or realism in the modern sense." Of course, we can never discuss anything "in the modern sense" when dealing with Byzantine literature. We do not, however, have to exclude terms, but to modify our use of them according to what the texts demand.



She is also the only character whose outward looks are described.<sup>440</sup> Hysmine's character is shown in her actions, from her first appearance. She is making the first advances, and as mentioned above she is aware of the machinations of Tyche. Later we learn that she is already an initiate of Eros (*H&H* 3.1). Both in action and speech the principle employed in the first part of the novel is repetition: she flirts repeatedly and makes comments to Hysminias, who reports them to Kratisthenes. As the story moves on, she engages in dialogue in which a sense of irony is sometimes brought forth (e.g. 4.3.3; 9.23). We must note the overturned conventions in Hysmine making the first advances, going beyond the typology of the ancient novel.<sup>441</sup>

Hysmine, like her male namesake, goes through a change, but at a closer look this change turns out to be the result of Hysminias' behaviour. Once Hysminias has fallen in love and begins to return Hysmine's advances, she changes and becomes more modest (*H&H* 4.3). Her behaviour has been seen as inconsistency of character, to which Alexiou answered that her behaviour is a reflection of the male perspective of Hysminias.<sup>442</sup> This is, of course, how the female temptress is traditionally considered to act: she invites—she rejects. This argument may be supported by the dialogue between the couple in 9.23, in which Hysminias mentions women's liability to change and Hysmine in her turn ironically praises the stability of men. But Hysmine's change of behaviour is in fact a reaction to Hysminias' change: he went from chaste to loving over one night (3.1–7). Hysmine points this out explicitly in 4.3.3: 'χθὲς τὸν παρθένον ἐπλάττου,' φησὶν, 'ὑπεκρίνου τὸν σώφρονα, καὶ νῦν καταρρητορεύεις τὸν ἔρωτα', "she said, 'Yesterday you played the virgin, you pretended to be chaste, and now you make speeches on behalf of love.'" Not only do characters in *H&H* change; their changes also affect other characters. This interaction is rather sophisticated, and adds to the sense of "realistic" character development.

The construction of the protagonists may be compared to that of the parents, who are depicted more or less as stereotypes or referential characters according to the genre conventions of the ancient novel. Hysmine's mother

---

<sup>440</sup> Similarly, Leukippe is the only character described in *L&K*, but in the *Aithiopika* both Charikleia and Theagenes are described in ekphraseis. On ekphraseis and other kinds of portrayal in Byzantine texts, see Aerts (1997); on the Komnenian novels, see pp. 188–192. Cf. Barber (1992) 17–18 on descriptions of female beauty in Psellos and Anna Komnene. On the ekphraseis of Hysmine and Leukippe, see below, pp. 251–252.

<sup>441</sup> This will be discussed below in pp. 251–256.

<sup>442</sup> Alexiou (1971) 32.

Panthia is the only parent to be portrayed in any detail, as a passionate and fairly unbalanced woman. This impression is partly made by the dream in which she appears as the crazy leader of a women's army (*H&H* 5.3–4). The dream of Hysminias may in its turn be induced or influenced by Panthia's behaviour at the first dinner, when she catches her daughter flirting with the herald guest:

Πανθία πρὸς τὴν κόρην ἄγει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ὅλους θυμοῦ, ὅλους ζήλου, καὶ πλήρεις αἵματος· εἰσβάλλει τούτους ἐπὶ τὴν κορυφὴν τῆς παιδός, ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας, ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον· ὅλην ἔχει τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν κόρην, καθ' ὅλης θυμοῦται, καθ' ὅλης ὀργίζεται· ἐρυθραίνεται τὴν παρειάν (ὃ καὶ παράδοξόν μοι δοκεῖ, θυμοῦ τικτόμενον ἔρευθος), ὡχρίᾳ πάλιν, ὥς τοῦ παντὸς ἐρυθρήματος καθ' ὅλου τοῦ τῆς Ὑσμίνης προσώπου καταρρύντος. (*H&H* 1.10.1)

Panthia turned her eyes on the girl, eyes which were full of fury, full of wrath and full of blood; she swept her eyes over the girl's head, her hands, her feet, her neck; looking over the whole girl, she was utterly furious and utterly enraged with her and her cheek grew red (it struck me as paradoxical, blushing engendered by rage); but soon she grew pale as if the blushes were draining away to Hysmine's face.

Panthia also reacts very strongly to the bad omen appearing at the sacrifice for Hysmine's wedding (6.10.3–6.11; 6.14.5–7). Her behaviour also causes other characters to react and discuss the meaning of the oracle (6.14.1–4, 6.15). She is contrasted to the wise and calm Themisteus, who finally persuades her to sleep. The detailed narrative of this episode makes Panthia's speech, mostly laments, cover more chapters than those of any other parent. Apart from shorter passages Themisteus, Sosthenes and Dianteia express themselves mainly in their laments towards the end of the novel (10.10–13).<sup>443</sup> The same kind of stereotypical or referential characters has been assigned to Rhodope and Sostratos.<sup>444</sup>

Kratisthenes is introduced as Hysminias' relative and alter ego: ἀδελφιδοῦς ἐμός, ἄλλος αὐτὸς (οὕτω γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν φίλον ὀρίζομαι), "my cousin, my other self (for so I define friend)" (*H&H* 1.7.2). Hysminias expects this definition of friendship to be mutual: εἴπερ οὐ κατέψευσαι τὴν φιλίαν καὶ τὸν σὸν Ὑσμινίαν φιλεῖς καὶ τὸν ἄλλον κρίνεις αὐτόν, "if your friendship is not a pretence and if Hysminias is your friend and you think of him

<sup>443</sup> In pp. 224–227 below we will see how the portrayal of Panthia should be considered in relation to Tatius' Pantheia in order to fully grasp Makrembolites' portrayal of her.

<sup>444</sup> Rhodope will be discussed in further detail below, pp. 258–259.



as your other self" (6.16.3).<sup>445</sup> This is the only thing the reader ever learns about Kratisthenes; no further information is given. Kratisthenes is one of the novel's main characters: he functions as Hysminias' helper and teacher of love, both as explaining Eros' powers and workings,<sup>446</sup> and as assistant in the affair with Hysmine.<sup>447</sup> Furthermore, as we have seen earlier, he functions as an exegete of the paintings in Sosthenes' garden—the medium through which Hysminias is introduced to love, and as a dialogue partner.<sup>448</sup>

Kratisthenes is filled with knowledge of love, but also with common sense<sup>449</sup> and irony.<sup>450</sup> Kratisthenes' character is constructed neither through repetition, as was the case with Hysminias, nor through relation or change—it is Hysminias who changes through their discussions, not Kratisthenes. Instead, the principle employed is accumulation: the character of Kratisthenes is brought forth in his continuous interpretations and advice. When he has given Hysminias the preliminary introduction to love and helped the couple to elope, he mysteriously disappears, presumably sailing off to Syria on his own, never to be seen again.<sup>451</sup> This should not be seen as a mistake on the part of the author; when Kratisthenes has "completed his mission" he is no longer needed in the plot.<sup>452</sup> The unfinished story-line was obviously of no concern to Makrembolites or his audience, and it may be compared to the unclosed end and the unfinished sub-plots in *L&K*.<sup>453</sup>

<sup>445</sup> The definition of a friend as another self goes back to Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1166a31–32; it recurs in Plutarch's two essays *De adulatore et amico* 53b and *De amicorum multitudine* 93e. Cf. also Porphyry, *Vita Pyth.* 33: τοὺς δὲ φίλους ὑπερηγάπα, κοινὰ μὲν τὰ τῶν φίλων εἶναι πρῶτος ἀποφηνάμενος, τὸν δὲ φίλον ἄλλον ἑαυτόν, "he loved his friends exceedingly, and was the first to declare that friends have everything in common and that a friend is your other self." On friendship in antiquity, see Konstan (1997); in Byzantium, see Tinnefeld (1973) and Mullett (1997) 111–123, including some Western parallels.

<sup>446</sup> In *H&H* 2.11; 2.14.4–6; 3.3.2–4; 3.9; 5.5.4.

<sup>447</sup> At the dinner in *H&H* 5.10–12, but note also the warning at the first dinner in 1.10.3; as a sentry in 4.4.1–2; at the escape in 6.16.

<sup>448</sup> See above, pp. 128–129.

<sup>449</sup> See e.g. his scolding of Hysminias in *H&H* 3.9, the interpretation of the dream in 5.5, or the interpretation of the omen in 6.13.

<sup>450</sup> See e.g. his comments in *H&H* 1.14.5 and 4.4.1–2.

<sup>451</sup> His last intervention is in *H&H* 7.13.1, when he tries to save Hysmine from being sacrificed.

<sup>452</sup> This is a specific trait of the helper function; see Bremond (1973) 282–294.

<sup>453</sup> See further below, pp. 190–191.

The unnamed characters in the novel may be considered in pairs: the captain and the priest of Apollo, and the master and mistress of Hysminias.<sup>454</sup> The captain and the priest are constructed in the same way, by their rhetorical utterances. They are also constructed as similar persons: the captain too is a priest, when he sets up the improvised altar and sacrifices Hysmine to the waves (*H&H* 7.12.3–4).<sup>455</sup> The priest of Apollo saves Hysmine and Hysminias by opposing their angry “owners” with clever rhetoric and irony. Sostratos and Hysminias’ master declare that they have a legal right to their slaves through military law, when the priest steps forward.

ὁ δέ γε στεφανῶν ἡμᾶς ἱερεὺς φησι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ‘εὖγε τῆς νομοθεσίας ὑμῖν, ὡς δουλαγωγεῖτε τοὺς Ἕλληνας· ὑπέρευγε εὐσεβείας, ὡς δουλογραφεῖτε τοὺς κήρυκας. 3 Ἀπόλλων χρησιμοδοτεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις ἀφοσιοῦται τὸ ἐλευθερον, οἷς νόμος Ἑλλήνων πρότερον καὶ φύσις αὐτὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀπεχαρίσατο· ἀντιχρησιμοδοτεῖτε δ’ ὑμεῖς, ἀντινομοθετεῖτε τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καταδουλοῦμενοι.’ 4 Οἱ δ’ ‘οὐχ ἡμεῖς’ φασιν ‘ἀντινομοθετοῦμεν, ἀλλ’ αἰχμὴ καὶ νόμος τούτους ἐδουλογράφησε στρατιωτικός.’ Καὶ δὴ μεθείλκον ἡμᾶς, ἡμεῖς δ’ οὐκ ἀπεσπώμεθα τῶν τοῦ Φοίβου ποδῶν.

15 Καὶ πάλιν αἱ μητέρες ἐθρήνουν, οἱ πατέρες κατεδυσώπουν καὶ γλώσση καὶ δάκρυσιν· καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ταῖς χερσὶν ἀπεμάχετο καὶ πείθειν οὐκ ἔχων ἀπεστεφανώθη τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἀπεδύσατο τὸν χιτῶνα καὶ τὴν ἀρβύλην ἀπέθετο καὶ ἀναβὰς ἐπ’ ὀκρίβαντος Στεντόρειον πρὸς τὸ πλήθος φησι 2 ‘τί μάτην ὁ πολὺς ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Δαφνίου συντρέχεις βωμόν; Τί καταδυσωπεῖς τὸν Ἐκηβόλου χρησιμοδοτεῖν; Ἐχεις τοὺς σεμνοὺς σοι τούτους νομοθέτας χρησιμοδοτήσοντας. Ἄλις σοι τῶν χρησιμοδοτημάτων, ὦ Φοῖβ’ Ἀπολλων, ἄλις σοι τῶν προμαντευμάτων, ἄλις σοι τῶν στεφανωμάτων.’ (*H&H* 10.14–10.15.2)

The priest who had put garlands on us said to them, ‘Your legal customs are excellent when you find yourself enslaving Greeks! And so is your piety when you enslave heralds! 3 Apollo has given an oracle and has decreed freedom for free men, on whom Greek law and nature itself had previously bestowed freedom; you pronounce another oracle and you make other laws by wishing to enslave free men.’ They replied, ‘It is not we who make these other laws but the spear and military law has put these people into slavery.’ And they tried to haul us off, but we would not let ourselves be dragged away from Phoibos’ feet.

15 Once again our mothers wailed and our fathers pled with tongue and tears. The priest fought with his hands and when he could not win them over, he took the garland from his head, he removed his tunic and took off his sandals, and going up onto the platform he proclaimed in stentorian tones to the crowd, 2 ‘Why do you, common man, in vain rush to the altar of Daphnian Apollo? Why do you ask

<sup>454</sup> Cf. Meunier (1991) 28–32, who does not include all the unnamed characters in her figure, only the master and the mistress.

<sup>455</sup> The sacrifice passage is quoted below in pp. 216–217, where the insertion of tragedy and Homer is discussed as a dramatic effect.



the Farshooter for oracles? You have these revered lawgivers to pronounce oracles for you. Enough of your oracles, Phoibos Apollo, enough of your prophecies, enough of your garlands.'

The priest thus forces the people to react: the crowd turns angrily upon the "lawgivers", and Hysmine and Hysminias are set free. As in the speech of the captain, there are certain Homeric reminiscences, e.g. the Stentorian voice<sup>456</sup> and the epithet of Apollo.<sup>457</sup>

The other nameless pair, Hysminias' master and mistress, are differently constructed: they are not similar, but contrasted as good and bad. Their characterisation is brief, expressed only in the discussions they have with and about Hysminias and their reactions to his story. When Hysminias tells his story for the first time, it seems that the mistress is kind, comforting him in his misfortunes (*H&H* 8.14.1), and the master unkind, telling him to forget his old life and be a slave (8.14.3–4). As the story goes along, we understand that the mistress is not very nice: she tries to seduce her slave behind her husband's back. We have already quoted and discussed the passages that reveal the mistress' acting.<sup>458</sup> One includes the master: in 8.20 the mistress tries to convince her husband not to bring Hysminias to Artykomis, but he opposes her and brings him along. The master may be hard, but he is fair. Relation is important here: the reader gathers information about the owners' characters not only through their reactions to Hysminias' story, but also through Hysminias' reaction to their behaviour. If he had accepted, or even felt tempted by the mistress' advances, the reader would be prepared to feel differently, and be more sympathetically disposed towards her.<sup>459</sup>

Characterisation in *H&H* is not dependent on descriptive detail, as one perhaps might expect, but on words and actions. The different characters show different character construction, from traditional stereotypes to rather complex relations between characters who react and interact.<sup>460</sup> Not only do the protagonists Hysmine and Hysminias react to each other, but Panthia and the priest of Apollo make people react strongly and thus cause change. The sub-plot of Hysminias' mistress and her advances is in itself also a character drawing, and in a similar way, short passages—often speech—

---

<sup>456</sup> Cf. *Il.* 5.785–786.

<sup>457</sup> E.g. *Il.* 1.14 and 96.

<sup>458</sup> See above, pp. 150–152.

<sup>459</sup> Cf. Kleitophon and Melite in *L&K*; see below, pp. 258–259.

<sup>460</sup> Cf. Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39: "causality in any psychological sense is totally absent." This is not true; as we have seen, the actions of Hysminias cause Hysmine to act, which in turn determines the fate of the couple.

need to be gathered and analysed together, since character traits may be sketched in just a few lines.

The character development that the hero character shows, and the relation-based character drawing of the heroine, lead to vivacity and “realism”. That sense of “realism” and even “modernity” is, however, in my view a consequence of the restricted viewpoint and the novel’s outspoken artificiality. The whole novel is like one long *ethopoeia* of which the aim is the display of erotic pathos.<sup>461</sup> This is seen by the author not in terms of realism, but from a rhetorical point of view.<sup>462</sup> The representation of pathos is, however, influenced by the same Aristotelian principles that have made the dreams psychologically correct dreams, yielding an impression of realism. Symbolic or allegorical functions do not necessarily have to be excluded. The characters of the novel, even if in relation to each other they function in a realistic manner, may still represent stereotypes of different kinds.<sup>463</sup>

---

<sup>461</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 145.

<sup>462</sup> Cf. above, p. 91, n. 142 on the concept of realism in modern scholarship.

<sup>463</sup> Cf. the allegorical interpretations of Poljakova (1979) and Plepelits (1989); cf. also above, pp. 31–32 on allegorical interpretations of the Byzantine novels.



## PART TWO

# Makrembolites and Achilles Tatius: Comparative Analysis

It is a common opinion that Makrembolites' novel is simply an imitation of Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon*. After the many judgements of this imitation as mechanical and tasteless, Alexiou (1977) was, as already mentioned, the first to argue that it was in fact carried out in an artful and creative way. In spite of this generally accepted notion—that Makrembolites imitated Tatius—there has been no serious attempt to make a comparative literary analysis of the two novels in order to show which elements have been imitated and how, or which elements have not been imitated. In this part of my study the dialogue between Makrembolites and Tatius will be investigated in some detail. I have tried to treat the two novels' relation as an intertextual dialogue rather than to consider them from the more traditional imitation perspective, which tends to degrade the imitation. Byzantine mimesis is not necessarily based on the principle "one model – one copy", and Makrembolites drew from many different sources, even if *L&K* is the primary hypotext of his novel.

### 2.1 Theoretical and methodological considerations

In the introduction I described briefly the disdainful attitude towards Byzantine mimesis, which has clearly begun to change.<sup>1</sup> After Jenkins' and Mango's articles in 1963 and 1975 respectively, several scholars urged a change in attitudes.<sup>2</sup> Discussions of mimesis now concern the concept of

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 43–44.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Kazhdan & Constable (1982) 96–116; Hanawalt (1986); Mullett (1990, 1992). These were, however, not the first scholars with such opinions; in fact, already Krumbacher, (1897<sup>2</sup>) 21–22, warned against viewing Byzantine literature as merely an extension of antiquity. One may also note that Jenkins' article is somewhat ambiguous in its approach to Byzantine imitation: on the one hand, Jenkins underlines the fact that many aspects of Byzantine literature do not have any Hellenistic background, which does imply some degree of independent creation on the part of the Byzantines; on the other he describes rhetoric, and thus mimesis, as a strait-jacket; Jenkins (1963) 52, and above, pp. 43–44.

imitation vs. originality and innovation, not only in literature but also in practical matters.<sup>3</sup> Byzantine art and literature are seen as expressions of a creative activity; at the same time they stand in constant relation to their ancient models. There are, however, certain risks in using terms such as innovation and originality.<sup>4</sup> Claims for originality were created as a reaction against claims for the lack of it. They should not be used as a means of defending Byzantine literature, or perhaps our own liking of it.<sup>5</sup> We need to move on and to ask ourselves and the texts new questions.<sup>6</sup> Should we really make great claims for originality, when the Byzantines themselves prided themselves on being imitative? Their own perceptions of imitation and innovation need to be taken into consideration: the fear of innovation, the sense of fidelity to a model, the importance of tradition.<sup>7</sup> As Littlewood suggests, "rather than thinking in terms of a polarity between originality and imitation, we should think in terms of an originality *within* a general imitative framework" [my italics].<sup>8</sup> The aspects we need to consider are those of tradition, generic modulation and mixture of genres, *variatio*, creative imitation, experiment and transformation, rather than those of imitation and innovation.<sup>9</sup>

---

The Byzantine imitation of the Hellenistic background is, in Jenkins' mind, a terrible thing, but at the same time its only extenuating circumstance: "let us be grateful that the Mediaeval Byzantine adhered with fidelity to at least some of the traditions handed down from a world more liberally minded and more cultivated than his own"; *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> The appearance of the volume edited by Mullett & Scott (1981), in which the new use that the Byzantines made of the classical tradition was emphasised, was symptomatic of the change in approach; even more so that edited by Littlewood (1995). The latter contains articles on both literature, art, and music. Dennis (1997a) discusses both military and medical matters (pp. 1–5) and literature and theology (pp. 6–9).

<sup>4</sup> See Mullett (1995) 39–40 on the concept of originality and Byzantine studies, and also *ead.* (1990) 258–259.

<sup>5</sup> See Hanawalt (1986) and Mullett (1990).

<sup>6</sup> Mullett (1995) 40; cf. Dennis (1997a) 8–9: "we keep asking the same questions and getting more or less the same answers. What I am suggesting is that *we* may be the ones stuck in a rut. Maybe it is time to ask different questions, to look at the Byzantine people in different ways, to examine and interpret our sources with more imagination. Perhaps, instead of wondering whether the Byzantines were creative or not, we should, in studying them, be more creative ourselves, and we may come to know them better."

<sup>7</sup> Mullett (1995) 40.

<sup>8</sup> Littlewood in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 40; Littlewood also remarks that this was pointed out already by Hunger (1969/70). Cf. Mullett (1995) 40 on the "central paradox" of Byzantine literature: "a sense that the Byzantines deny the existence of change, but that change, however slow it may be, surely and perceptibly exists."

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Mullett (1995), Dennis (1997a), and also Agapitos in Ljubarskij et al. (1998) 24–29 on mixture of genre and interpretation "from within".



The concepts of inter- and transtextuality serves our purposes well. "Intertextual" is one of the few modern theoretical terms that were adopted without further ado by classical philologists, which gives an indication of its appropriateness for our field.<sup>10</sup> It was originally introduced by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s, and thereafter adapted and developed by a number of scholars.<sup>11</sup> The most comprehensive study is that of Genette, whose central concept is that of transtextuality, based on the thought that the object of poetics is the text's *textual transcendence*, its textual linkage to other texts.<sup>12</sup> He starts from the idea that literature is by nature *palimpsestuous*,<sup>13</sup> i.e. any text is a *hypertext*, grafting itself upon a *hypotext*, an earlier text that it imitates and transforms. Some texts are more hypertextual than others, more explicitly palimpsestuous. For those who work with ancient and Byzantine literature, this is already a matter of course, and the function of a palimpsest is also familiar. Due to the textual transcendence of literature, Genette does not use "intertextual" as an overall category, but instead the term *transtextual*. He then makes a distinction between five kinds of transtextuality: *intertextual* (quotation, plagiarism, allusion); *paratextual* (relations established through titles, prefaces, covers); *metatextual* (commentary and criticism); *architextual* (interrelations of types of discourse and genres); *hypertextual* (the relationship uniting the hypertext with the hypotext).<sup>14</sup> These categories are not to be viewed as separate or absolute; their relationships are numerous and often crucial.<sup>15</sup>

We may look at *H&H* as an example. This novel displays all the different kinds of transtextuality: it contains a large number of quotations and allusions (intertextuality); it has a title that immediately recalls those of the ancient novels (paratextuality); it comments more or less explicitly upon the tradition of Eros and theories of dreams (metatextuality); it adheres through a number of *topoi* to the genre of the ancient novel (architextuality); it is a clear hypertext of the hypotext *L&K* (hypertextuality).

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. Van Erp Taalman Kip (1994) on Theocritus, or Zimmermann (1997) on the ancient novel. Fusillo's important study (1991) of the ancient novel is based on the concept of intertextuality.

<sup>11</sup> Kristeva (1969); Kristeva was influenced by Bakhtin's theory of the dialogical nature of literature. On intertextual aspects of texts, see also Riffaterre (1979, 1980a, 1983) and Bloom (1973).

<sup>12</sup> Genette (1997). The book is a reworking of earlier thoughts and includes a number of rebaptisings of terms earlier defined in id. (1987, 1992).

<sup>13</sup> The term is not originally Genette's, but was coined by Philippe Lejeune; Genette (1997) ix.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. 1–5.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. 7.

A great advantage of Genette's method is that it does not view imitation as something negative, since textual transcendence is inherent in all literature; in fact, direct imitation *cannot* exist, since the imitation then would be the *same* text.<sup>16</sup> According to Genette, there are two basic kinds of hypertexts: *transformation* and *imitation*.<sup>17</sup> Imitation too is transformation, but it involves a more complex process.<sup>18</sup> As an example, Genette describes how both the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* are hypertexts of the *Odyssey*, but *Ulysses* is a direct or simple transformation that transposes the action of the *Odyssey* to twentieth-century Dublin; the *Aeneid*, on the other hand, is an indirect or complex transformation, i.e. an imitation, that tells a different story in the manner of Homer.<sup>19</sup> It is quite obvious that we cannot put *H&H* in one of these two categories; the novel both transposes some of the action of *L&K*, and tells some different material in the manner of *L&K*, or in the manner of the genre. This is where the different kinds of transtextuality can help us to define the relationships between the two texts in a more specific manner. Genette's approach brings to the fore the complexity of transtextual relations and the positive nature of imitation; this is why it is so useful in this context, owing to the intercommunicative nature of Byzantine literature.

One of the aims of the earlier studies of the ancient and Byzantine novels was to find and identify their different models or sources, their generic background. The traditional *Quellenforschung* is indeed important, but the significant question is not from which source an element has been drawn, but for which use it has been inserted and adopted in its new context.<sup>20</sup> Fusillo has investigated the ancient novel's generic background according to this notion, i.e. the individual authors' use of stock material and its new function.<sup>21</sup> The ancient novelists drew from ancient sources such as epic and lyric, tragedy

---

<sup>16</sup> See *ibid.* esp. 5–7, 81–85.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* 7: "what I call hypertext, then, is any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call from now on *transformation*, or through indirect transformation, which I shall label *imitation*."

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 6: "in order to transform a text, a simple and mechanical gesture might suffice [...]. But in order to imitate a text, it is inevitably necessary to acquire at least a partial mastery of it, a mastery of that specific quality that one has chosen to imitate."

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 6–7.

<sup>20</sup> See the criticism of Conte (1986) 23: "without a basic model of literary production, I would argue, the philologist's collecting of comparative and contrastive materials (loans, debts, parallels etc.) suffers from what I may disrespectfully name 'comparisonitis'—collecting for the sake of collecting."

<sup>21</sup> Fusillo (1991).



and comedy, history and oratory.<sup>22</sup> The Byzantine novelists, in their turn, used the ancient novels as generic models, but other ancient genres also continued to be read throughout the Byzantine period.

Against this background, it is rather simplistic to assume that Makrembolites based his novel entirely on one model (*L&K*), or that all his ancient material was to be found in that model; nor can we be sure that he used exclusively ancient material.<sup>23</sup> One can thus distinguish in *H&H* a number of transtextual layers: on the one hand, the novel's hypotext is *L&K* regarding form and motifs; on the other it is full of a large number of quotations from ancient literature and allusions to works outside the novelistic literature. But the author also writes in relation both to the ancient novelistic tradition on the whole and to other genres from which form and content may have been drawn. Another aspect of the mimetic tradition is that contemporary authors used the same material in similar or slightly different ways, creating yet another frame of reference for the audience.<sup>24</sup>

It will not be attempted here to identify all the different sources that Makrembolites may have drawn from, but rather to draw attention to the fact that a Byzantine novelist could find subject matter for his text without mechanically imitating an ancient novel. To compose a literary text without allowing oneself to be influenced by things read, heard, or seen is, in any case, virtually impossible; this is an inevitable presupposition of art itself and thus of transtextuality.

## 2.2 Analysis

### 2.2.1 Story

Achilles Tatius follows more or less the established conventions of the novel; *L&K* shares many motifs with other ancient novels, and in particular with that of Heliodoros.<sup>25</sup> The main story line runs as follows: Kleitophon,

---

<sup>22</sup> The generic background of the ancient novel was first investigated by Rohde (1913<sup>3</sup>); for more recent perspectives, see Giangrande (1962); Perry (1967) 1–149; Riffaterre (1990) on the different approaches to genre; Lowe (2000) 222–258 on the novel as “epic fiction” drawing on, above all, New Comedy. On the ancient novel and the role of rhetoric, see Rohde, *ibid.* 336–360; Perry, *ibid.* 19, n. 7; Hägg (1983) 107–108; Reardon (1991) 84, 87–89 on the importance of progymnasmata; Hock (1997).

<sup>23</sup> See the remarks by Conca (1994b) 92–93, 104.

<sup>24</sup> In the 12th century in particular we can see a tendency to engage in dialogue with other texts, for example the interaction of Basilakes' progymnasmata with *H&H*, or the novel's possible indebtedness to them. Cf. also the mixture of genres; see above, p. 29.

<sup>25</sup> It has now been established that Heliodoros drew from Tatius, and not the other way around; see above, p. 23. On Tatius as a parody of the *Aithiopika* or as a comic novel, see

the hero-narrator, is a young man from Tyre. He is betrothed to his half-sister Kalligone, but falls in love with his cousin Leukippe, who has come from Byzantium to stay at Kleitophon's father's house together with her mother. The wedding to Kalligone is prevented by the girl being kidnapped by a certain Kallisthenes. When Kleitophon and Leukippe are caught in Leukippe's bedroom by her mother they decide to elope, together with Kleitophon's slave Satyros and his relative Kleinias. They all board a ship for Alexandria, but the ship is wrecked in a storm. The young couple are parted from the others and are washed ashore at Pelusium in Egypt. They travel through the Nile delta towards Alexandria, during which journey a number of adventures befall them: they are attacked by brigands, but saved by Greek troops, and Leukippe is constantly threatened by unwanted suitors. She is also apparently sacrificed by the brigands, who cut open her stomach and grill her intestines on an altar; this is her first apparent death. The couple finally arrive safely in Alexandria, only to see Leukippe kidnapped by their new friend Chaireas; she is apparently beheaded in front of Kleitophon who thinks her dead. After six months of deep mourning, Kleitophon agrees to marry the beautiful widow Melite, and they travel to her home in Ephesos. There, one of Melite's slave girls turns out to be Leukippe. After complex intrigues and lengthy legal proceedings—Kleitophon is sentenced to death for another apparent murder of Leukippe—Leukippe's father Sostratos arrives as the head of a religious embassy. The couple are reunited, Leukippe passes a chastity test, and they travel to Byzantium to get married, then back to Tyre.<sup>26</sup>

The definition of "established conventions" for the sophistic novels is based on the material of the non-sophistic novels: Chariton's *Chaireas & Kallirhoe* and Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*. Investigations of the sophistic novels have shown that they presuppose a novelistic tradition already established.<sup>27</sup> It should, however, be noted that the three sophistic novels, in spite of the similarities between Tatius and Heliodoros, are different and individual works of literature. The sophistic novelists used the standard models in highly different ways. For example, while the bucolic *Daphnis &*

---

Rattenbury (1933), Durham (1938), Heiserman (1977) 118–130, Anderson (1982, 1997), and Fusillo (1991) 97–98; cf. Reardon (1994) esp. 92–93. See now also Chew (2000) with references to both previous interpretations and modern theory of parody and genre. The interpretation of *L&K* as a parody is by Chew, as previously by Anderson, seen as related to generic connections with New Comedy; cf. Lowe (2000) 222–224. Cf. also Kaimio (1995) 132, n. 51 on the problem of humour in ancient novels.

<sup>26</sup> For a more detailed summary of *L&K*, see the Appendix.

<sup>27</sup> Fusillo (1991) 75.



*Chloe* takes place in a rustic milieu governed by nature and the seasons, *L&K* and the *Aithiopika* are, like their non-sophistic “ancestors”, enacted in an adventurous world filled with journeys, pirates and shipwrecks. But they are different from each other too: Heliodoros seems to have concentrated on religious aspects, while Tatius is more comic and burlesque.<sup>28</sup> In one respect all the three sophistic novels differ from their predecessors: in the novels of Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesos the protagonists are married at the outset, and the action consists of a struggle to return to that marriage; in those of the sophistic novelists, marriage is the happy ending following the struggle to be together.

In order to distinguish Tatius’ use of convention, let us compare him with the “typical” novel story line, as described by John Morgan:

Archetypically, a supremely handsome young man and a supremely beautiful young woman fall in love at first sight. Somehow they are separated and launched into a series of adventures which take them all over the Mediterranean world. They undergo shipwreck, meet pirates and bandits, attract the unwanted sexual attentions of third parties, and believe one another dead. But through everything they remain true to one another and are eventually reunited to pass the rest of their lives in wedded bliss.<sup>29</sup>

In one respect in particular Tatius does not fit into this description: love at first sight. Kleitophon falls in love with Leukippe when he first sets eyes on her, but she has to be gradually convinced by his elaborate wooing.<sup>30</sup> There are also other variations. For example, the protagonists are not too idealised: Leukippe loses her mind, is sacrificed in front of a throng of men, is beheaded in the same manner, is almost raped several times, and as a slave she is shorn and beaten; Kleitophon does not do much to help her, and he does not stay faithful to her.<sup>31</sup> These features are part of Tatius’ somewhat distorted reuse of stock conventions and traditional elements.<sup>32</sup> Morgan’s summary shows how easy it is to generalise about a genre and its character, since “typical” may in the end turn out to be “original”. We should keep this in mind during the comparison of *L&K* and *H&H*. A similar use of a

---

<sup>28</sup> Fusillo, *ibid.* underlines that the two authors “soumettent ce modèle standard à des transformations notables.”

<sup>29</sup> Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 2.

<sup>30</sup> Hägg (1983) 51–53; Anderson (1997) 2284–2285. On love at first sight as a more or less timeless model, see Rousset (1981) esp. 203–204 on Tatius. Cf. Jouanno (1994) on the role of the eyes in the ancient and Byzantine novel.

<sup>31</sup> Fusillo (1991) 66 and 101; on *L&K* as pastiche/réécriture, see pp. 97–108; on modified stock conventions, see esp. p. 98.

<sup>32</sup> See Reardon (1994) 86–87 (on love), 87–88, 91 (on rivals and fidelity/chastity), 88 (on reunion).

rather uncomplicated love story is not enough to define an imitative relation between two authors.<sup>33</sup>

The plot of *L&K* is rather complex and contains a number of sub-plots. Most of the sub-plots run parallel to the main story line,<sup>34</sup> and they all interact to a varying degree with it. For example, the death of Charikles may seem unattached to the main plot, but ultimately it causes Kleinias to elope together with Kleitophon. Kleinias disappears, but then reappears and follows Kleitophon to Ephesos, where he plays an important role in the final intrigue. The wooing of Charmides, on the other hand, and the poisoning by Gorgias, do not affect the main story line so much, but create suspense and make the intrigue eventful and exciting. A character may be introduced as actor in a sub-plot, but then ends up interfering with the main action: Chaereas appears as helping Leukippe recover from the poisoning caused by Gorgias (*L&K* 4.18), but turns out to greatly affect the story by kidnapping Leukippe (5.3–7 and 8.16).<sup>35</sup> The opposite happens in the story of Kallisthenes and Kalligone: Kalligone is kidnapped, which puts off her wedding with Kleitophon (2.13–18), but then the happy ending, which now is unattached to the main story line, is narrated (8.17–18). As we can see, most of the sub-plots and parallel action concern threats to Leukippe's chastity. Melite, the only threat to Kleitophon's chastity, must be considered as one of the main characters, since her "marriage" to Kleitophon is an important part of the plot. The parallel love-story of Kleio and Satyros (2.4.2) is dropped at the outset, when Kleio elopes and is never mentioned again.<sup>36</sup>

The novel also contains a large number of digressions, often in the form of encyclopedic material: pseudoscientific explanations, geographical or ethnographical descriptions, paradoxography. These may vary in length, from a few lines to whole paragraphs or more. Other digressions, sometimes whole stories within the story, are also inserted, e.g. the fables told by Konops and Satyros in *L&K* 2.21–22.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> It is a common mistake to treat the ancient novels in this manner, which has led to a number of unfair and simplistic statements. Cf. Beaton's attempt to treat the "medieval Greek romance" as a unified genre (1996<sup>2</sup>), an approach that necessarily simplifies matters more than one should; cf. also Doody (1996) and Tonnet (1996).

<sup>34</sup> The death of Charikles (*L&K* 1.12–14); the adventures of Menelaos and Satyros (3.19–22); the wooing of Charmides in book 4; the poisoning by Gorgias (4.15); the adventures of Kleinias (5.8, 5.9–10).

<sup>35</sup> For a similar development, see the role of Menelaos in *L&K* 2.34 and book 4.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *L&K* 2.31.2, where Satyros hints at another affair, parallel to the one he had with Kleio.

<sup>37</sup> We will return to Tatius' use of digression below, pp. 197–200.



There are certainly similarities in the story stuff used by Makrembolites and Tatius. Many of the elements in *H&H* are, however, stock conventions of the ancient novels: the setting in a pagan, vaguely late antique world, the travel motif, complete with shipwreck, apparent death and pirates, the final reunion and marriage, with the chastity of the heroine still intact. As mentioned earlier, we cannot take for granted that Makrembolites drew all of them from *L&K*; he must have been familiar with Heliodoros, most probably with Longus and perhaps also with the non-sophistic novels.<sup>38</sup>

There is no evidence—in the sense of recorded readings such as those by Photios and Psellos—of Chariton or Xenophon Ephesios from the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>39</sup> It does, however, seem probable, judging from internal evidence, that the twelfth-century novelists were familiar at least with the *Ephesiaka*.<sup>40</sup> Even though the novels of Xenophon Ephesios and Chariton are not mentioned by Photios in the *Bibliothēke*, they have been transmitted alongside Longus and Tatius in a thirteenth-century codex now in Florence, the Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 627 (F).<sup>41</sup> This is the *codex unicus* of the two pre-sophistic novels. Someone must accordingly have had in his possession a manuscript of these ancient novels, from which the Laurentianus could be copied. It is reasonable to assume that the pre-sophistic and the sophistic novels also before the writing of the Laurentianus, and certainly during the revival in the twelfth century, were perceived more or less as one genre. The pre-sophistic novels may not have become as popular in Byzantium as the sophistic ones, but they were copied and thus presumably read.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. “the golden rule” of Schmeling (1980) 139: “much of the later influence realized by ancient prose fiction was exerted by the total corpus of ancient novels and not so very much by individual works.”

<sup>39</sup> The only testimony to the existence of Xenophon of Ephesos is a few lines in the *Suda*,  $\Xi$  50; on this somewhat problematic passage, see Kytzler (1996) 345–346. There seems to be traces of the *Eph.* in Aristainetus in the 5th century, and Hesychius mentions it around 500; *ibid.* 357 and n. 31.

<sup>40</sup> On the possible influences of the *Eph.* in *H&H*, see Alexiou (1977) 35–36. On possible allusions to Chariton’s novel in *Kallimachos & Chrysorrhoe*, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 151.

<sup>41</sup> For a brief description of the content of the Laurentianus, see Agapitos (1998a) 126–127 with further references; see also Vilborg (1955) xix. Of *L&K* only the first part is transmitted in this manuscript; it leaves off at 4.4.4. The Laurentianus also contains an anthology of 12th-century court poetry, and prose and letters by late antique and Byzantine authors; Agapitos, *ibid.* 126–127 and n. 12. Cf. Kytzler (1996) 358 and Winkler (1994) 23 on the “theological treatises” in the Laurentianus.

We need to examine the subject-matter of Makrembolites and Tatius in closer detail in order to distinguish which elements are shared, or not shared, by the two novelists. The couples of the two novels both meet owing to hospitality, *ξενία*, which gives them an opportunity to live within the same household and get to know each other. This was a convenient invention of Tatius, enabling him to concentrate on the couple's communication and the gradual development of their love, and also their ending up in bed together early in the story.<sup>42</sup> But there are differences in Makrembolites' adaptation. First of all, the circumstances of the first meeting are different: in *H&H* Hysminias is sent as a herald to the home-town of Hysmine, and thus the hero is entertained as a guest in the heroine's home; in *L&K* Leukippe is a guest in the hero's home. This device may be characterised as inversion, an important part of creative imitation. It is also possible that Makrembolites was inspired by one of Tatius' sub-plots, in which Kallisthenes comes as a herald to Tyre from where he abducts Kalligone, whom he later falls in love with and marries.<sup>43</sup> We should also note that Hysmine and Hysminias are not related to each other, whereas Leukippe is Kleitophon's cousin, and Kalligone, whom he was supposed to marry, was his paternal half-sister.<sup>44</sup> Hysmine and Hysminias do, however, have a special bonding by means of their names, which indicates something more than kinship; they are "twin souls" and thus meant for each other by Fate.<sup>45</sup>

Like Tatius, Makrembolites devotes the first part of his novel to the wooing of the heroine and the gradual development of love between the young couple.<sup>46</sup> But unlike Tatius, he emphasises the inexperience, even erotic *aporia* of the hero, Hysmine being the active party in the first two books.<sup>47</sup> Kleitophon too shows a certain ignorance on the matter (*L&K*

<sup>42</sup> Anderson (1997) 2280.

<sup>43</sup> We should note that Makrembolites uses the term *κήρυξ*, whereas Tatius in most cases uses *θεωρός* (*L&K* 2.15.1; 2.17.1; 7.12.3), and *κήρυξ* only once (*L&K* 8.10.10); cf. Heliodoros' *κήρυξ* (*Aith.* 4.1.1; 4.2.1; 4.3.3; 4.5.5; 7.3.3; 8.9.10; 9.20.2; 10.4.4; 10.16.3; 10.25.1) and also Longus' *D&C* 3.2.2; 3.2.4.

<sup>44</sup> In late antiquity, marriage was often allowed between half-brother and half-sister; Winkler (1989) 178. In Byzantium, according to the canonical law, matters were different; see e.g. canon LIV in *The Canons of the Council of Trullo (The Quinisext Council)*; Engl. trans. in Schaff (1977) 390–391. It is possible that Makrembolites removed the family relation between the protagonists for the favour of Platonic bonds due to moral reasons.

<sup>45</sup> See above, pp. 156–159.

<sup>46</sup> Tatius' novel here differs from the *topos* "love at first sight" in the other novels; on his and Makrembolites' use of the traditional motif, see Jouanno (1994) 149–151, 156–157.

<sup>47</sup> The only counterpart to this complete amorous and sexual ignorance on the part of the hero is found in Longus' *D&C*; Alexiou (1977) 36.



1.9.7), but he still seems to have had some sexual experience (2.37.7). The initiation into the mysteries of Eros covers half of *H&H*—the first 6 books—until the couple elope in book 7. During this period the couple's meetings take place partly in the garden (in the garden of Hysmine's father in Aulikomis), partly during dinners (both in Aulikomis and in Eurykomis), just like the meetings of Leukippe and Kleitophon.<sup>48</sup> The gardens of the two novels recall each other, but they both adhere to the same *topos*, and thus Makrembolites' garden has not necessarily been modelled upon that of Tatius.<sup>49</sup> The two novels' heroes are both advised by friends: Kleitophon by Kleinias (his relative) and Satyros (his servant); Hysminias by Kratisthenes, his friend and "alter ego".<sup>50</sup>

When Hysmine and Hysminias elope, they are assisted by Kratisthenes, just as Leukippe and Kleitophon are helped by Kleinias. Leukippe and Kleitophon manage to stay together throughout their first adventure: a storm that causes a shipwreck. It is not until they have reached the delta of the Nile that they are attacked by brigands, who wrest Leukippe out of Kleitophon's arms and apparently sacrifice her on an altar. In *H&H*, the storm that rises at sea is calmed by the sacrifice to Poseidon of Hysmine, who is wrenched out of Hysminias' arms and thrown into the sea.

Both Leukippe and Hysmine eventually turn up as slave-girls, and they reveal their true identity by means of letters to the heroes. The heroes are both subjected to sexual harassment by the girls' mistresses; but Kleitophon has in fact already been "married" to Melite for quite some time when he finds out about Leukippe, while Hysminias has been enslaved himself and already been harassed by his own mistress. An important difference is that Hysminias never gives up his chastity, while Kleitophon in fact does have sex with Melite as a slightly twisted act of farewell.<sup>51</sup>

The final reunion takes place at religious festivals in both novels.<sup>52</sup> The couples are helped by priests (in *L&K* a priest of Artemis; in *H&H* a priest of Apollo), and the same priests invite them and their relatives (in Tatius

<sup>48</sup> But note the deliberate snaring of the lovers by Eros in *H&H*, which may be compared to that in the *Ephesiaka*; Alexiou (1977) 35. From the same novel may have been drawn the immodesty of the heroine; *ibid* 35–36.

<sup>49</sup> See above, pp. 97–103, and below, pp. 209–213.

<sup>50</sup> See below, pp. 256–258.

<sup>51</sup> *L&K* 5.27. Cf. Longus' *D&C*, where Daphnis is taught the mysteries of love by the experienced woman Lykainion.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. the *Aith.* book 10. Elements possibly drawn from Heliodoros, as suggested by Alexiou (1977) 35, are the pagan festivals and sacrifices, the pretence that the lovers are related, the description of a city sacked by pirates, and the references to Hellenes and Philhellenes; but cf. above, p. 122 on Hellenism and its relation to contemporary Byzantium.

only Leukippe's father) to dinners, during which the protagonists relate their stories. The adventures come to an end with the final chastity tests, but the ordeals are quite differently performed in the two novels.<sup>53</sup>

In comparing the story material of the two novels we can see that Makrembolites has indeed drawn material from *L&K*. It has, however, not been mechanically imitated, but every element of the plot has been reshaped and transformed, for example by means of inversion. This is a tendency of which we will see many examples in this part of the study as we investigate the different levels of narrative technique in some closer detail. We must also note that many elements have in fact been left out in the later novel, e.g. the detailed descriptions of the shipwreck, the many attacks by or on pirates, the apparent murders or sacrifices, and the legal proceedings. The paradoxographical material has been dropped, with only some traces remaining.<sup>54</sup> The discussions on homosexuality are completely left out; a few misogynistic comments, which in *L&K* are tied to the love of the same sex, remain.<sup>55</sup> The hero's seduction by another woman—Kleitophon having sex with Melite—has no parallel in *H&H*; although Hysminias is harassed, he is not even tempted. No threats to Hysmine's chastity appear in *H&H*. Compared to the continuous rape attempts on Leukippe this difference is striking.<sup>56</sup>

The basic ingredients may be the same, but the story told by Makrembolites is another; it is slower and less action-packed than the model. Indecent, burlesque and exotic detail from *L&K* has been left out, and replaced by elaborate descriptions of works of art and rhetorical expositions on the part of the narrator. As we have seen in Part 1, this does not mean that *H&H* is uneventful, just that action and suspense function on different levels. Nor is it less erotic, rather the contrary, but eroticism is achieved by different

---

<sup>53</sup> See below, pp. 219–222. In the *Aithiopika* Theagenes and Charikleia are equally tested; in the novels of Chariton and Xenophon there is no reason for this, since the couples are already married at the outset.

<sup>54</sup> E.g. the myth of the palm, *L&K* 1.17.3–5, *H&H* 10.3; see below, pp. 235–236.

<sup>55</sup> Homosexuality was generally condemned in Byzantium as, according to the Church, “against nature”; see Bullough (1976) 317–346, Boswell (1981) 137–166, Troianos (1989), and Laiou (1992) 74–84. On eunuchs, often associated with homosexuality, see Ringrose (1994) and Tougher (1997). Eunuchs, along with other young, beardless men, could be refused admittance to monasteries in an attempt to protect monks from temptation; see Galatariotou (1987b), whose discussion on homosexuality in Byzantium, esp. pp. 121–124, is considered one of the best.

<sup>56</sup> These may have been the indecent aspects particularly disliked by Photios (cod. 87); see above, p. 26. Cf. Psellos' mentioning of the sacrifice of Leukippe in *Synkrisis* 84–86.



means. The result is instead a focusing on the central functions of art and maturation. We will return to all these issues in the following analysis.

### 2.2.2 Composition

*L&K* opens with the author-narrator arriving at Sidon, where he chances upon a painting of Europa, Zeus, and Eros. While admiring the painting he is approached by a young man who, according to himself, has been maltreated by love. This is the hero-narrator Kleitophon, whose story—beginning in *L&K* 1.3—is the novel proper. The opening paragraph consists of a description of the city of Sidon.

Σιδῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ πόλις· Ἀσσυρίων<sup>57</sup> ἡ θάλασσα· μήτηρ Φοινίκων ἡ πόλις·  
Θηβαίων ὁ δῆμος πατήρ. δίδυμος λιμὴν ἐν κόλπῳ πλατύς, ἡρέμα κλείων τὸ  
πέλαγος· ἥ γὰρ ὁ κόλπος κατὰ πλευρὰν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ κοιλαίνεται, στόμα δεύτερον  
ὀρώρυκται, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὖθις εἰσρεῖ, καὶ γίνεται τοῦ λιμένος ἄλλος λιμὴν, ὡς  
χειμάζειν μὲν ταύτῃ τὰς ὀλκάδας ἐν γαλήνῃ, θερίζειν δὲ τοῦ λιμένος εἰς τὸ  
προκόλπιον. 2 ἐνταῦθα ἦκων ἐκ πολλοῦ χειμῶνος σῶστρον ἔθουον ἑμαυτοῦ τῇ  
τῶν Φοινίκων θεᾷ· Ἀσάρτην αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν οἱ Σιδῶνιοι. περιῶν οὖν καὶ  
τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν καὶ περισκοπῶν τὰ ἀναθήματα ὁρῶ γραφὴν ἀνακειμένην γῆς  
ἅμα καὶ θαλάττης. Εὐρώπης ἡ γραφή· Φοινίκων ἡ θάλασσα; Σιδῶνος ἡ γῆ. 3  
ἐν τῇ γῇ λειμῶν καὶ χορὸς παρθένων. ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ ταῦρος ἐπενήχετο, καὶ  
τοῖς νῶτοις καλὴ παρθένος ἐπεκάθητο, ἐπὶ Κρήτην τῷ ταύρῳ πλέουσα. (*L&K*  
1.1.1–3)

Sidon is a city beside the sea. The sea is the Assyrian; the city is the metropolis of Phoenicia; its people are the forefathers of Thebes. Nestled in its bosom, discretely refusing the ocean's advances, is a broad double harbor: where the bay curves round on the right, a second entrance has been channelled, a further inlet for the tide water, a harbor within the harbor. There the great freighters calmly wait out the storms of winter and in the summer ply the harbor's forebay. 2 Arriving at this port after a violent storm, in thanks for my safe arrival I offered a sacrifice to the Phoenicians' great goddess, who in Sidon is known as Astarte. Then touring the rest of the city to see its memorial offerings, I saw a votive painting whose scene was set on land and sea alike: the picture was of Europa; the sea was Phoenicia's; the land was Sidon. 3 On the land were represented a meadow and a chorus of maidens, on the sea swam a bull, and on his back was seated a beautiful maiden, sailing on the bull towards Crete.

Then follows a detailed ekphrasis of the painting: the meadow in flower and the maidens expressing both joy and fear at the sight of the bull. Around the bull, dolphins and erotes are swimming, and Eros is leading the bull (1.1.3–

<sup>57</sup> Vilborg's unnecessary correction of Ἀσσυρίων into Συρίων has been changed; see O'Sullivan (1980) s.v. Ἀσσύριοι, cf. Vilborg (1962) 18. See also Winkler (1989) 175: "it was a mark of archaizing elegance to use Assyria for Syria."

13). The narrator expresses his admiration of Eros' power. At this point a person standing nearby catches the narrator's attention.

ταῦτά μου λέγοντος νεανίσκος καὶ αὐτὸς παρεστώς, 'Εγὼ ταῦτα ἂν εἰδείην,'  
ἔφη, 'τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών.' 2 'Καὶ τί πέπονθας, ὦ ἀγαθέ; καὶ  
γὰρ ὁρῶ σου τὴν ὄψιν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς.' 'Σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις,'  
εἶπε, 'λόγων' τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε.' 'Μὴ κατοκνήσης, ὦ βέλτιστε,' ἔφην,  
'πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Ἑρωτος αὐτοῦ, ταύτη μᾶλλον ἥσσειν, εἰ καὶ μύθοις  
ἔοικε.' 3 καὶ ταῦτα δὴ λέγων δεξιούμαί τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τινος ἄλσους ἄγω  
γείτονος, ἔνθα πλάτανοι μὲν ἐπεφύκησαν πολλοὶ καὶ πυκναί, παρέρρει δὲ  
ὔδωρ ψυχρόν τε καὶ διαυγές, οἶον ἀπὸ χίονος ἄρτι λυθείσης ἔρχεται. καθίσας  
οὖν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τινος θώκου χαμαιζήλου καὶ αὐτὸς παρακαθισάμενος, 'ὦ  
ρα σοι,' ἔφην, 'τῆς τῶν λόγων ἀκροάσεως' πάντως δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ  
μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν.'

3 Ὁ δὲ ἄρχεται τοῦ λέγειν ὥδε·

'Εμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος, Τύρος ἡ πατρίς, ὄνομα Κλειτοφών, [...]. (*L&K* 1.2.1–1.3.1)

At this point a young man standing nearby said, 'How well I know it—for all the indignities Love has made *me* suffer.' 2 'And what have you suffered, my friend? You have the look, I know it well, of one who has progressed far in his initiation into Love's mysteries.' 'You are poking up a wasp's nest of narrative. My life has been very storied.' 'Well sir, by Zeus and by Eros himself, please don't hesitate. The more storied the better.' 3 I clasped his right hand and we walked to a grove nearby where many plane trees grew in dense array and a stream meandered, cold and clear as if from fresh-melted snow. When we had found a low bench to sit on, I said, 'See, here we have the perfect spot for your story—a delightful place and a setting for tales of love.'

3 And he began to speak as follows.

'I was born at Tyre in Phoenicia. My name is Kleitophon [...].'

If we compare this opening to that of *H&H* we are immediately struck by one clear similarity, namely the description of a city.<sup>58</sup> The central part of *L&K* 1.1.1 concerns the harbour, which is elaborately described; it is at this harbour that the author-narrator arrives.<sup>59</sup> The two aspects of Eurykomis that we are informed of are its beauty/excellence (*H&H* 1.1.1) and its religious tradition (*H&H* 1.1.2). It is the religious aspect that is the important part, since it explains the situation in which Hysminias is presented. The religious aspect of Sidon is explained in *L&K* 1.1.2: the temple of Astarte. Basically, then, the two descriptions concern the cities' external and religious characteristics. In *L&K*, Sidon is the setting of the frame story—as far

<sup>58</sup> The opening passage of *H&H* is quoted above, pp. 51–52. Cf. also the opening description of Mytilene in Longus' *D&C* 1.1.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. the harbour of Mytilene in Longus' *D&C*; Palm (1965) 183: "der schöne Hafen" war ein beliebtes Thema in den Landschaftsbeschreibungen."



as we know without connection to the plot—and it leads up to the ekphrasis of one of its votive paintings. In *H&H*, Eurykomis is the starting-point for the story, and is part of the presentation of the hero. This may be compared to the more traditional, “oral epic” introduction of the hero in *L&K* 1.3.1.<sup>60</sup> In neither novel is the reader taken back to the initial setting: we never find out why Kleitophon ended up in Sidon, and the protagonists of *H&H* do not return to Eurykomis after the first cycle of journeys.<sup>61</sup>

The extensive ekphrasis of the painting of Europa that follows sets the erotic tone and states the theme of *L&K* and anticipates some of its main action: the heroine is taken away from her family by the hero, and then kidnapped repeatedly throughout the novel.<sup>62</sup> The paintings in *H&H* appear later, after the ekphrasis of the garden of Sosthenes in which they all belong; these paintings too express the themes of the novel.<sup>63</sup> The garden description in *L&K* does not appear until the end of book 1 (*L&K* 1.15). In *H&H* the different kinds of ekphraseis have been rearranged: the garden motif has been moved to the beginning of the novel in order to gradually present its content, the paintings, and the discussions that are attached to them. As we will see later, the ekphraseis in *H&H* have also been mixed with the narrative in a manner different from that of the painting of Europa in *L&K*, which is just an anticipating or generative starting point, and not part of the action. Also, the narrative frame has been dropped for the benefit of an epistolary situation. The only listener (or reader) at Hysminias’ disposal is the somewhat mysterious Charidoux, who may have been brought in to replace the framing narrative act in *L&K*.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Alexiou (1977) 30.

<sup>61</sup> On the closure of the two novels, see below, pp. 189–191.

<sup>62</sup> On this ekphrasis and its construction, see Palm (1965) 183–185. See also Bartsch (1989) 40–45, 48–55, 62–65 on its proleptic function; cf. Hägg (1992). Cf. also Nimis (1998) 101, 102–104, who argues that the function of the description is generative, rather than symbolic or proleptic.

<sup>63</sup> See above, pp. 123–135.

<sup>64</sup> On Charidoux, see above, pp. 52, 89, 154. Genette’s concept of *external* and *internal narratees* has been adopted by Fusillo (1991) 178–186. An external narratee does not take part in the action, whereas internal narratees do (for example the priests listening to the protagonists’ stories in both novels). The external narratee in *L&K* is the initial narrator, the fictional author; in *H&H*, it is Charidoux. The conventional *curiositas* on the part of the external narratee has thus been dropped—Charidoux does not intervene with any questions—but it may still be hinted at in the very presence of Charidoux, alluding to the narrative frame of *L&K*.

## NOVEL AND PHILOSOPHY

*L&K* 1.2.3 is reminiscent of the setting of Plato's *Phaedrus*.<sup>65</sup> The grove with its plane trees and the cool water of the spring mirrors Plato's famous grove, and the narrator explicitly identifies it as the perfect place for telling stories of Eros, *μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν*.<sup>66</sup> The Platonic *locus amoenus* was a *topos* frequently used by authors of the Second Sophistic;<sup>67</sup> indeed, the potential of the entire *Phaedrus* as an object of classicising mimesis is well documented.<sup>68</sup> For the "literature of love" this dialogue, along with the *Symposium*, was a great influence, evident in the few works that have come down to us.<sup>69</sup> The Platonic opening, along with a number of other references to the *Phaedrus* in *L&K*, is accordingly not surprising.<sup>70</sup> Nor was Tatius the only ancient novelist to insert Phaedran references; Xenophon of Ephesos,<sup>71</sup> Chariton,<sup>72</sup> and Longus<sup>73</sup> all did. The Platonic imitations and allusions probably had a double function, as both philosophical and stylistic elements.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Plato, *Phdr.* 229a–230c, esp. 230b–c.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *L&K* 1.16.6, where Kleitophon chooses the garden as a setting for his erotic myths which presumably will turn Leukippe on (as in *L&K* 1.6.6). An inverted situation is that of "Eros the Sophist" in *L&K* 1.10.1, i.e. "love makes people talk"; cf. Halperin (1992) 104–105 on logoi conceived *after* erotic encounters; *Phdr.* 278a6–7 and *Sym.* 208e1–209e4 and 210a7–8, c1–3, d4–6.

<sup>67</sup> Palm (1965) 185; Trapp (1990) 141–148, 171. Plutarch's imitation in *Amatorius* 749a is particularly remarkable, since he has the speaker comment upon the frequency of such imitation and thus excludes it from his own dialogue, "but the very denial signals a Phaedran presence"; Trapp, *ibid.* 159.

<sup>68</sup> A number of orators recommend Plato and/or the *Phaedrus* as a model, e.g. Cicero (*Or.* 3.10) and Hermogenes (e.g. *Id.* 2.4, Spengel II, 358), and sophists like Philostratus imitate the *Phaedrus*; see Trapp (1990) esp. 171–173 (appendix with examples).

<sup>69</sup> Only three works of this genre have come down to us in their entirety: Plutarch's *Amatorius*, Pseudo-Lucian's *Amores* and Maximus of Tyre's *Dialexeis* 18–21 ("What was Socrates' art of love?"). Surviving titles, however, testify to a rich tradition; Trapp (1990) 146–147, 155–164.

<sup>70</sup> *L&K* 1.4.4, 1.9.4 and 5.13.4 are all based on *Phdr.* 251b–c and 255b–d (on the creation of love by the outflow of beauty from the beloved into the lover's soul through his eyes); Trapp (1990) 155.

<sup>71</sup> *Eph.* 1.3.2 and 1.9.6–8, cf. *Phdr.* 251b–c and 255b–d; Trapp, *ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> *C&K* 8.1.3 seems to echo *Phdr.* 242b–243d; Trapp, *ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> *D&C* 1.22.4, cf. *Phdr.* 255d; *D&C* 2.7.1, cf. *Phdr.* 249d; Trapp, *ibid.* Also, *D&C* 1.25–26 may be inspired by *Phdr.* 259a–c; Hunter (1983) 32, 56–57.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Trapp (1990) 155: "in all these cases the *Phaedrus* is being used to infuse *either* [my italics] a modicum of philosophy, or a little of the stylistic sweetness for which it was so admired by the rhetors." See Hunter (1983) 92–98 on stylistic sweetness, γλυκύτης, in Longus; Hunter's discussion starts from Hermogenes (*Id.* 2.4, Spengel II, 357–364), who brings in the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium* as exemplary models.



The Platonic references in *L&K* have led to an interpretation of the novel as a Platonic, or non-Platonic, philosophical essay on love.<sup>75</sup> I would like to suggest that Makrembolites recognised and acknowledged Tatius' Platonic aspects, and that he composed *H&H* in accordance with that philosophical-erotic tone. I argued in the first part of this study that Makrembolites' novel displays a generic influence from the philosophical essay in the manner of Plutarch, and that Charidoux accordingly functions as the pupil addressee, Kratisthenes as the dialogue partner and exegete.<sup>76</sup> I also suggested that the homonymity of the protagonists reflects the thoughts of erotic unity expressed in the *Symposium*.<sup>77</sup> These devices all have parallels in Tatius' novel, in other ancient novels, and/or in the philosophical dialogue.

Makrembolites has not adopted the Phaedran setting, which appears in a number of sophistic *erotikoi logoi*.<sup>78</sup> It was, however, not unknown to the Byzantines. It was used in an elaborate manner to create a setting for artistic inspiration by at least two authors. Theodoros Daphnopates, in a letter to Constantine Porphyrogennetos, describes how he experienced poetic inspiration in the mountains under an oak—a variant of the Platonic situation.<sup>79</sup> John Geometres, in one of his garden ekphraseis, describes a setting reminiscent of both the *Phaedrus* and the novels.<sup>80</sup> There is, however, another Platonic, or rather Socratic, reference in the first part of *H&H*. When Hysminias relates his arrival at Aulikomis, he describes the throng of people that greets him in the following manner: ἐμὲ δὲ περιεστᾶσι, καὶ λαμπρόν τινα χορὸν τοῦτον ἐλίσσουσιν, οἷον καὶ Σωκράτην οἱ ζηλωταὶ περιεστῆκεισαν, “they pressed around me and they spun around in that brilliant dance that devotees of Socrates used to perform around him” (*H&H*

<sup>75</sup> Anderson (1982) 23–32 even refers to Tatius as “Plato *Eroticus*”; on Plato see esp. p. 25. See also id. (1997) 2280. See also below, p. 191, on the closure of *L&K* as an imitation of the *Symposium*.

<sup>76</sup> See above, pp. 52, 128–129, 154, 161–162.

<sup>77</sup> See above, p. 157.

<sup>78</sup> *L&K* 1.2.3, Ps.-Lucian's *Amores* 31, and Plutarch's *Amatorius* 749a; Trapp (1990) 146–147.

<sup>79</sup> Theodoros Daphnopates, Κωνσταντίνῳ Πορφυρογεννήτῳ τῷ φιλοχρίστῳ βασιλεῖ; letter 12 in Darrouzès & Westerink (1978) 145–147. Note esp. lines 12–13: ἀλλ' ὅρα καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς σκέψεως· ὑπὸ δρυὶ καλῇ καὶ σκιερᾷ, ἔνθεν ῥέειν' ποιητικῶς 'ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ', τὴν στιβάδα πηξάμενος, τῆς γραφῆς ἀπηρχόμην, “eh bien voici la façon dont j'ai composé. Sous un beau chêne ombreux, d'où coulait”, comme le dit le poète, ‘un ruisseau clair’, couché dans l'herbe, je commençai à écrire.”

<sup>80</sup> John Geometres, Ἐπιστολὴ κήπου ἐκφραστική; no. 2 in Littlewood (1972) 7–9. Esp. 8.23–29, on which see Littlewood's commentary in pp. 48–49, but note also the addressee ὦ φιλότῃς in 8.8, commented on p. 47. On Geometres' garden descriptions, see also above, p. 101, n. 191.

1.3.2). The remark is puzzling, unless Makrembolites in fact hints both at *L&K* as a primary hypotext, and metatextually at his own text as a “philosophical essay”.<sup>81</sup>

The discussions of the paintings in *H&H* are referred to as φιλοσοφείν, “to do philosophy”.<sup>82</sup> The verb appears in a similar sense in Tatius, where it refers to dialogues on love. It is used first in *L&K* 1.12.1, where Kleitophon ends his and Kleinias’ discussion on Eros with ταῦτα ἐφιλοσοφοῦμεν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, “thus we were philosophising about the god.”<sup>83</sup> The meaning of the verb is, however, fluid: besides the meaning “discussing” or “discoursing”, it also refers to the widely different “restraining oneself”, “abstaining from sex”,<sup>84</sup> or even “seducing someone”.<sup>85</sup> Seduction, when described as φιλοσοφείν, is carried out by the use of sophistic discourse. The reader was told early in the novel that Eros is a self-taught sophist, αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστής (*L&K* 1.10.1), and this is how Melite convinces Kleitophon to get into bed with her (*L&K* 5.25.4–5.26). The characteristics of Eros are then repeated in a slightly different manner: αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὁ ἔρως καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστής, “for love is handy and resourceful, a

<sup>81</sup> Cf. the right to reject the Phaedran opening that is displayed in Plutarch’s *Amatorius*; see above, p. 181, n. 67. The passage in *H&H* may, however, be compared to Plato, *Protagoras* 315b, where the admirers of Protagoras form a “dancing attendance”, spinning around him as they follow him: τοῦτον τὸν χορὸν μάλιστα ἔγωγε ἰδὼν ἦσθην, ὡς καλῶς ἡδύλαβοντο μηδέποτε ἐμποδῶν ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν εἶναι Πρωταγόρου, ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἀναστρέφοι καὶ οἱ μετ’ ἐκείνου, εὖ πως καὶ ἐν κόσμῳ περιεσχίζοντο οὗτοι οἱ ἐπήκοοι ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν, καὶ ἐν κύκλῳ περιμόντες ἀεὶ εἰς τὸ ὀπίσθεν καθίσταντο κάλλιστα, “as for me, when I saw their evolutions I was delighted with the admirable care they took not to hinder Protagoras at any moment by getting in front; but whenever the master turned about and those with him, it was fine to see the orderly manner in which his train of listeners split up in two parties on this side and on that, and wheeling round formed up again each time in his rear most admirably.” Trans. by Lamb (1952). Although the central figure here is not Socrates, but Protagoras, it is Socrates who tells the story; it is likely that Makrembolites, alluding from memory, remembered the passage vaguely and made a mistake.

<sup>82</sup> *H&H* 2.8.1, 4.18.1 and 4.19.1; in 4.1.3, 7.13.2 and 7.14.3 the verb refers to any kind of rhetorical discourse.

<sup>83</sup> Goldhill (1995) 79. Winkler translates “we were thus rapt in deep philosophy concerning the god”. On the verb φιλοσοφείν in *H&H* and *L&K*, see Goldhill, *ibid.* 94–98 and Cupane (2000) 29. See also Dostálová (1993) 49 on the mystic and Neoplatonic tones in *H&H*, evident in the allegorical paintings and the use of φιλοσοφείν; cf. the Neoplatonic interpretation of Heliodoros by Philip the Philosopher; see Sandy in Zimmermann, Panayotakis & Keulen (2000) 102–103, and above, p. 25 and n. 83.

<sup>84</sup> O’Sullivan (1980) s.v. φιλοσοφῶ.

<sup>85</sup> Goldhill (1995) 94–96; see also Cupane (2000) 29, n. 29, who emphasises the ironic tone of the verb.



clever *bricoleur*” (L&K 5.27.4).<sup>86</sup> Philosophy is in this way ironically connected with erotic discourse.

In Prodlromos’ *R&D*, Dosikles once philosophises on the nature of love in the same manner as Kratisthenes and Hysminias do.<sup>87</sup> Dosikles is interrupted by his audience with the following remark:

‘Παύου, Δοσίκληις, ὦν μάτην λέγεις λόγων’  
ἔφασαν οὗτοι· ‘μὴ γίνου δημηγόρος  
(ἀπρόσφορος γὰρ ἄρτι φιλοσοφία)·  
ἀλλὰ σκοπῶμεν ἐμφρόνως τὸ πρακτέον.’ (R&D 2.434)

‘Cease your idle talk, Dosikles!’ they said. ‘Don’t play the popular orator (for at the moment philosophy is out of place); let us instead be sensible and consider how to act.’<sup>88</sup>

Again, *φιλοσοφία* is used for “discourse on the subject of love”.<sup>89</sup> But in fact, the speech of Dosikles is not just any kind of love talk; it falls back upon the Platonic discussion on the age and nature of Eros in the *Symposium*.<sup>90</sup> This is the same hypotext that Tatius and Longus drew upon in their discussions on Eros.<sup>91</sup>

Platonic dialogue appears also in other Komnenian novels. In book 7 of *R&D*, there is a dialogue between Vryaxes and Dosikles, in which Dosikles is led by Platonic questions and answers to agree that his own execution by sacrifice is a logical step. Only Kratandros’ Socratic response dissuades Vryaxes from proceeding.<sup>92</sup> Also Eugenianos’ novel contains allusions to

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Goldhill (1995) 96.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *H&H* 2.9–10.

<sup>88</sup> Transl. in MacAlister (1991) 206, n. 97, with some minor changes of my own.

<sup>89</sup> MacAlister (1991) 205–207 interprets the passage by Prodlromos, along with *H&H* 2.9–10, as polemical, reflecting a contemporary political mood in which philosophy was actually dangerous. Cf. Cupane (2000) 29, n. 29, who argues that the connotations of *philosophia* in Prodlromos are those of Tatius, i.e. *ironic* rather than polemic. We should remember, though, the notion of rhetoric’s inherent *amphoteroglossia* as described by Tzetzēs (see above, p. 148, n. 390); from that perspective, *philosophia* may well function as rhetorical discourse of Eros as in *L&K* and *H&H*, and at the same time as an allusion to the contemporary situation.

<sup>90</sup> *R&D* 2.421–431; cf. Plato, *Sym.* 178c and 195b; Cupane (2000) 29, n. 29.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *D&C* 2.5.2 and *L&K* 1.2.1; MacAlister (1991) 206, n. 96; Cupane (2000) 29, n. 29. It is interesting to note that the second column of the *Metiochos & Parthenope* fragment also contains a philosophical inquiry (*φιλοσόφου ζήτησις*) into the nature of Eros; the following discussion includes the age and nature of Eros. For a discussion of the novel, the Greek text and an English translation with commentary, see Stephens and Winkler (1995) 72–93. On *Metiochos & Parthenope*, see also below, pp. 205–206.

<sup>92</sup> *R&D* 7.400–445; Jeffreys (1998) 193.

Plato's work.<sup>93</sup> In all the Komnenian novels these Platonic expressions and thoughts are combined with the Aristotelian interpretations of dreams and oracles. The analysis by MacAlister has already been discussed: she argued that the Komnenian novelists' rejection of the prognostic qualities of dreams reflected a mood of intellectualism connected with the scholarly activities in contemporary Byzantine society.<sup>94</sup> The movement was represented in the eleventh century by the works of Psellos and John Italos, and continued in the twelfth century by a revival of Aristotelian scholarship.<sup>95</sup> Among the early works, Psellos' ekphrasis of a statue of Eros is quite remarkable in our context.<sup>96</sup> The ekphrasis consists of two parts, in the first of which the Platonic aspects of Eros are described with an abundance of echoes from the *Phaedrus*; the second part is a set-piece description of the statue.<sup>97</sup>

The commentaries on the works of Aristotle were carried out mainly by two scholars, Eustratios of Nicaea and Michael of Ephesos.<sup>98</sup> Eustratios and Michael were both pupils of Italos, pupil of Psellos, and they were both financially supported between 1130 and 1150 by Anna Komnene.<sup>99</sup> The princess was for a period also the patroness of Prodromos, the court poet and author of *R&D*.<sup>100</sup> There is thus a clear connection between the philosophical works of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the novels.<sup>101</sup> This connection is indicated also in the manuscript Oxford Baroccianus 131, which, among other texts, transmits a large number of philosophical treatises reflecting Aristotelian scholarship, including excerpts from Aristotle, imperial and late antique texts, essays by Psellos himself or slightly later compilers, alongside Makrembolites' *H&H*.<sup>102</sup>

I do not argue that *H&H* was actually seen as a philosophical text, by either its author or its audience. Plato, being a central school author, was one

<sup>93</sup> See Conca (1990, 1994a) and Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 55, n. 14.

<sup>94</sup> See above, p. 110.

<sup>95</sup> MacAlister (1990) 196.

<sup>96</sup> Psellos, Ἐκφρασις εἰς Ἐρωτα ἐγγεγλυμμένον λίθῳ, "Ekphrasis concerning [a statue of] Eros carved in stone"; no. 34 in Littlewood (1985) 129–131.

<sup>97</sup> Dostálová (1993) 51. The ekphrasis will be discussed in an iconographical and philosophical context below, p. 206.

<sup>98</sup> MacAlister (1990) 196–198; (1994b) 318–319.

<sup>99</sup> Browning (1962) 6–8; Sideras (1994) 178–180; Mullett (1984) 178; Agapitos (1998a) 142.

<sup>100</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 146 and n. 139.

<sup>101</sup> On the revival of and interest in drama in the same circles, see Agapitos (1998a) 142.

<sup>102</sup> On the manuscript (1250–1280) and its content, see Agapitos (1998a) 139–140; for a description of the Barocci MS, see Wilson (1978).



of the ancient authors most frequently quoted in Byzantium.<sup>103</sup> His dialogues were seen as important literary models, and thus imitations were not necessarily conceived as having philosophical connotations.<sup>104</sup> Makrembolites seems to have been playing with *mixis* of genre, drawing compositional devices from the philosophical essay, and combining them with the ancient novel. He also added further Platonic and Aristotelian references: *L&K*, and perhaps also other ancient or Hellenistic *erotikoi logoi* or novels, functioned as sources for the Platonic material; contemporary scholarship provided Aristotelian subject matter. The result of Makrembolites' experimental composition is, if not a philosophical essay on love according to the Hellenistic standards, then surely a Byzantine essay on love and art.

#### ADVANCING THE PLOT

Due to the many sub-plots and the parallel action, *L&K* displays an internal reference system of recapitulations and anticipations which is rather complex.<sup>105</sup> There are only three regular recapitulations, i.e. passages that report action which has taken place before the eyes of the reader: the first two, *L&K* 1.9.1 and 8.4.3–4, are short, and the third, 8.5, is partly elliptical. By elliptical recapitulation I mean a recapitulation taking place without the events being repeated in the text, e.g. the end of 8.5.4: *πέπραται, δεδούλευκε, γῆν ἔσκαψε, σεσύληται τῆς κεφαλῆς τὸ κάλλος· τὴν κουρὰν ὀράς.* 'καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ὡς ἐγένετο διεξήειν, "she was sold, enslaved; she hoed the ground; her beautiful hair was ravaged. You see how she's shorn.' I went through each event as it happened."

*L&K* 8.5 is significant, because it contains so much commentary upon the narrative act itself. We shall look at a couple of examples:

ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μελίτην ἐγενόμην, ἐξῆρουν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐψευδόμην, [...]. τὴν ναῦν διηγησάμην, τὸν εἰς Ἑφεσον πλοῦν, καὶ ὡς ἄμφω συνεκαθεύδομεν, καί, μὰ ταύτην τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ὡς ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀνέστη γυνή. 3 ἐν μόνον παρήκα τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ δραμάτων, [...]. 5 κὰν τῷδε κατὰ τὸν Σωσθένην καὶ Θέρσανδρον γενόμενος ἐξῆρουν καὶ τὰ αὐτῆς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰμά, [...]. (*L&K* 8.5.2–5)

<sup>103</sup> Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 8.

<sup>104</sup> Plato is recommended to aspiring writers in a treatise by Psellos, *Περὶ χαρακτήρων συγγραμμάτων* τινῶν; text in Boissonade (1964) 48–52, and English translation in Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 172–174. See *Peri Characteron* 50.13–14: *συμπαλαμβάνον δὲ τῷ καταλόγῳ καὶ τοὺς Πλατωνικοὺς διαλόγους*, "I also included in my list Plato's dialogues", and also 51.18–28 on the literary style of Plato as incomparable to other philosophers and orators.

<sup>105</sup> On anticipations and recapitulations in *L&K*, see Hägg (1971a) 234–242, 277–285.

When I reached the chapters about Melite, I modified my account of my behaviour to emphasize my chastity (though I told no positive lies) [...]. I included in my narrative the ship, the voyage to Ephesos, our sleeping together, and, 'I swear by Artemis here present,' how she rose from bed as a woman from another woman. 3 I omitted only one scene [...]. 5 Here too, when I got to the part about Sosthenes and Thersandros, I elaborated her tale even more than my own [...].

This kind of recapitulation differs greatly from the repetition of events in *H&H*, where commentary of this kind does not occur. Hysminias the narrator does not comment upon the *construction* of his own narration, since the wanted effect is one of immediacy and "now". On the other hand, he includes comments that bring to the fore the feelings that the narration imposes upon him, such as the Homeric "may you not, o soul, escape the barrier of my teeth!" (*H&H* 7.15.2)<sup>106</sup>

Apart from *L&K* 8.5, which is partly elliptical, there are three elliptical recapitulations in Tatius' novel.<sup>107</sup> To sustain the sub-plots, there are recapitulations reporting action that the reader, and presumably the narrator, has been unaware of.<sup>108</sup> The letter of Leukippe in *L&K* 5.18 functions in a similar manner. The novel also contains short recapitulating comments necessary to sustain the construction of parallel action, for example, in 2.31.2: εἶχε δὲ ἑτέραν ἢ Λευκίππη θαλαμηπόλον, ἣν τῷ αὐτῷ φαρμάκῳ καταβαπτίσας ὁ Σάτυρος (προσεπεποίητο γὰρ καὶ αὐτῆς, ἐξ οὗ τῷ θαλάμῳ προσεληλύθει, ἐρᾶν), "Leukippe had a second chambermaid, whom he drugged with the same potion (he had pretended to be in love with her too, from the day she joined the household)." There is no repetitive pattern similar to that of *H&H*; in fact, actions are rarely repeated at all. When they are, the author avoids repetition in the elliptical manner described above: καὶ μεταξὺ δειπνοῦντες ἐμυθολογοῦμεν ἅ τε τὴν προτέραν ἐτύχομεν εἰπόντες καὶ εἴ τι ἐπιδεέστερον ἦν ὧν ἐπάθομεν, "during dinner we told again the same stories as the day before and filled in the blanks that had been left" (*L&K* 8.15.3). Tatius thus avoids what Makrembolites apparently strives to achieve: the refrain-like rhythm of a poetic text.<sup>109</sup>

Since *L&K* is narrated in the first person from a non-omniscient narrative position, there are no regular anticipations of coming actions; whereas Kleitophon the narrator displays his knowledge of what will happen,

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *Il.* 9.409; see above, p. 153. Comments on the narrative act within the narrative will also be discussed below, pp. 246–247.

<sup>107</sup> *L&K* 2.34.7, 3.14.2, and 8.15.3.

<sup>108</sup> *L&K* 3.19–22 (Menelaos and Satyros), 5.9–10 (Kleinias) 8.16 (Leukippe), 8.17–18 (Sostratos on Kalligone).

<sup>109</sup> See above, pp. 64–74.



Kleitophon the protagonist is not supposed to know.<sup>110</sup> There are a few exceptions where the narrator hints at future events without revealing anything about them, such as *L&K* 5.2.3, ἀλλ' ἔμενευ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλο τῆς Τύχης γυμνάσιον, "but further trials were in store for us on Fortune's obstacle course."<sup>111</sup> Instead, anticipations are expressed mainly in descriptions of paintings and dreams. There are three ekphraseis of works of art: a votive tablet depicting the abduction of Europa in Sidon (1.2–13), a painting of Prometheus and Andromeda on the wall of a temple of Zeus Kasios in Pelusium (3.6–8), and a painting of Philomela, Prokne and Tereus in an artist's workshop in Alexandria (5.3.4–8). The function of these ekphraseis has been investigated by Shadi Bartsch, who argues that the ekphraseis in *L&K* (as in Heliodoros and many other works of the Second Sophistic) serve as hermeneutic keys to the readers, foreshadowing and anticipating events to come.<sup>112</sup>

There are four dreams in Tatius' novel, two of them arranged in a pair: Kleitophon's dream of Kalligone (*L&K* 1.3.4); Pantheia's dream of Leukippe (2.23); Leukippe's and Kleitophon's dreams of Artemis and Aphrodite respectively (4.1).<sup>113</sup> Pairing such as this occurs also in the diptych of Prometheus and Andromeda mentioned above. There are even double motivations, for example in the painting of Europa foreshadowing both the kidnapping of Kalligone and the elopement of Leukippe.<sup>114</sup> Some of the other digressions have an equally proleptic function.<sup>115</sup> The proleptic function of dreams and ekphraseis in *L&K* is different from their more pragmatic func-

<sup>110</sup> However, in the latter part of *L&K*, the narrator does, in fact, tend towards omniscience; Hägg (1971a), 124–136, 137. See further below, pp. 243–244.

<sup>111</sup> See also *L&K* 5.23 and 7.12.3.

<sup>112</sup> Bartsch (1989) 40–79 on pictorial descriptions. I do not agree that all paintings have a proleptic function. In my view, Bartsch tends to overinterpret the symbolic meaning of descriptions, and her interpretations of *L&K* 3.6–8 and 5.3.4–8 are tenuous; *ibid* 55–59 and 68–76, cf. the cautionary remarks by Hägg (1992). Cf. also Dostálová (1993) 47–48 on the symbolic meaning of Tatius' ekphraseis, and on the connection with allegorical/ philosophical descriptions.

<sup>113</sup> Bartsch (1989) 80–108 on dreams and oracles; on the double dream in *L&K* 4.1.3–7 see pp. 89–93. See also MacAlister (1997) 67, 71–74, 77–78 on dreams and pp. 30–32 on omens in *L&K*.

<sup>114</sup> Bartsch (1989) 63–65; MacAlister (1996) 86. Bartsch's analysis of the painting of Europa is much more convincing than those of the other two paintings. See also above, pp. 178–180.

<sup>115</sup> Bartsch (1989) 144–170 on "other descriptions", i.e. paradoxographical and ethnographical digressions. Note, however, again Bartsch's tendency to overinterpret, e.g. the description of the cup in *L&K* 2.3.2 as foreshadowing the entire progression of the protagonists' love affair; Hägg (1992) 193.

tion in *H&H*: in the Byzantine novel the Aristotelian dream interpretation is dominant, and even though some dreams do mirror future events they are not as evident as in the ancient novel. The paintings in Sosthenes' garden do not anticipate action, but express the theme of the novel: the problematics of love, the process of maturity and the nature of art.<sup>116</sup>

*L&K* is filled with digressions on different subjects. These are most often tied to the progress of the plot, functioning as retardation, and, as just mentioned, sometimes as anticipation. Like the dreams and the paintings, they may appear in pairs.<sup>117</sup> There are also a number of long philosophical dialogues on the nature of love, which to some degree recur in *H&H*.<sup>118</sup> As we saw in Part 1, repetition is an important and dominant principle in the composition of *H&H*. There is hardly any repetition in *L&K*, even if some doubling occurs, and there is no parallel whatsoever to the particular doubling of the plot in *H&H*. This is a conspicuous difference in the composition of the two novels. Whereas *H&H* is poetically constructed with "refrains" and recurring themes (i.e. *spatial*), *L&K* is narrated in a more traditional form, where suspense is created by means of a chronological structure, and repetition, as we saw above, is left out in order to avoid unnecessary length.

#### CLOSURE

*L&K* closes with Kleitophon and Leukippe having been married in Byzantium and having returned to Tyre to attend the marriage of Kalligone and Kallisthenes. The last sentence runs as follows: καὶ διεγνώκαμεν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ παραχειμάσαντες διελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, "we decided to spend the winter in Tyre and then make our way to Byzantium" (*L&K* 8.19.3). The narrative frame from the opening situation in Sidon is never closed. The unclosed frame-story has worried scholars, causing them to accuse Tatius of forgetfulness or incompetence.<sup>119</sup> In response, it has been suggested that the

<sup>116</sup> See above, pp. 123–135.

<sup>117</sup> The form and function of digressive and descriptive material will be discussed in further detail below, pp. 193–200.

<sup>118</sup> See above, pp. 183–184.

<sup>119</sup> Three explanations are brought up by Vilborg (1962) 140: (a) the end of the novel is incomplete, (b) the author has forgotten his introduction, or (c) "the author may have found that it would disturb the narrative to take up the frame story again"; Vilborg finds the latter most likely. Cf. Gaselee (1947) 455: "our author seems to have forgotten that the story began by being Clitophon's narration to himself. The narration took place in Sidon, and there should have been a few words to round up the book to explain how it came about that Clitophon found himself at Sidon, and for the author to thank him for his interesting



opening frame launches the whole story, and that this is all Tatius intended with it.<sup>120</sup> This view has been questioned by Glenn Most, who argues that the opening narrative situation has been influenced, or rather necessitated, by the Greek tradition that autobiographical narrative can only be told out of an imminent need. Tatius has thus, according to Most, adopted the so-called *stranger's stratagem*, a reason for Kleitophon to speak of his amorous misfortunes. The happy ending of the novel precluded a return to the initial autobiographical setting, since autobiographies always end tragically in antiquity.<sup>121</sup>

It is, however, common for a framing situation not to be repeated; the introduction of the narrator, as in *L&K*, gives a sense of authenticity, an *effet de réel*, but does not require the author to return to the initial frame.<sup>122</sup> There are, in fact, a number of loose ends in the novel, and the author—or his readers—obviously did not see it as a problem. The modern reader's need of a "proper closure" was not part of the ancient reader's horizon of expectation.<sup>123</sup> One ancient example is Plato's *Symposium*; another is Theocritus' *Idyll* 13.<sup>124</sup>

The contrast to the carefully constructed closing epilogue in *H&H* is striking. Again, I think that we need to consider the general character of the two works. The closed end of Makrembolites' novel underlines the work's artificiality, and it correlates with the novel's circular construction and carefully balanced structure.<sup>125</sup> Bartsch has argued for a similar background for

---

narration." But as Vilborg says, "the ordinary reader hardly feels that something is amiss here"; *ibid.*

<sup>120</sup> First argued by Hägg (1971a) 125–126; on the opening scene, see also Plepelits (1980) 28; Hunter (1983) 38–40; Bartsch (1989) 168–170; Fusillo (1991) 168 and (1997) 220; Nimis (1998) esp. 102–104.

<sup>121</sup> Most (1989).

<sup>122</sup> Fusillo (1997) 220. Fusillo sees the closure as connected with the comical tradition which, according to him, is important for the understanding of *L&K*; Fusillo (1991) 178 and (1997) 221.

<sup>123</sup> See e.g. the frank remarks by Fowler (1994) 231: "'closure' in all its senses has often been seen as a distinguishing characteristic of classicism. [...] No one, of course, has ever really believed this nonsense." A closed frame is often missing even in the 19th-century novel; it was not until the late 19th century that the novel was accepted as an artistic genre that could meet with aesthetic and not just moral demands; see e.g. Bakhtin (1981) 3–40. On the modern conception of literary works as closed units, as opposed to the open texts of a manuscript culture, see Bruns (1982) 44–59.

<sup>124</sup> Fusillo (1997) 220. On the concept of closure in ancient texts, see Fowler (1989, 1994, 1997); for examples of "classical closures", see the articles in Roberts, Dunn & Fowler (1997); on the ancient novels, see Fusillo (1997).

<sup>125</sup> Devices such as Makrembolites' epilogue occur in other ancient novels. It may, for example, be compared to the end of the *Eph.*, in which the protagonists visit the temple of

Tatius' open closure, which she sees as an intentional omission that serves to underline the artificiality of the novel.<sup>126</sup> I do not agree with this. *L&K* is indeed to a certain degree artificial, as are all the literary products of the Second Sophistic, but we have already seen that the open end is a phenomenon occurring in antiquity. Winkler has suggested that the closure of *L&K* is an imitation of the closure in the *Symposium*,<sup>127</sup> which I think is more probable. The artificiality of *L&K* lies, in my view, mainly in its reuse of tradition and the sometimes absurd turns of the plot.

If we look at the distribution of the material that Makrembolites has drawn from Tatius, almost all of it, both subject matter, motifs, and vocabulary, derives from *L&K* books 1–2. Most of the material from *L&K* books 3–8 has *not* been adopted by Makrembolites, for example most of the adventures of the protagonists and the court scenes. All the material that has been adopted has been reshaped and reorganised. The only detail that is still in “the same place” in the two novels is the opening description of a city. Now, does this have any particular significance? I think it may be seen in relation to the contrast between the open and closed ends. Firstly, there is a general tendency for beginnings to be “better”, in the sense of being more carefully constructed, than the rest of a literary work, which is true for *L&K*. This is the part of Tatius' novel where Makrembolites finds the ekphrasis and the subject matter on Eros, which is where his primary interest lies. Secondly, there is also a general tendency for imitators to be more “faithful” at the beginning, and then rework and change more and more. By imitating, in his own way, the beginning of *L&K*, Makrembolites signals the generic characteristics of his work to his audience, and then he moves on to do his own version. The end of *H&H* accordingly correlates with the novel's overall artistic and poetic character, and not with that of *L&K*.

---

Artemis with offerings including “an inscription in honour of the goddess, commemorating all their sufferings and all their adventures” (*Eph.* 5.15.2: ἀνέθεσαν ἀναθήματα καὶ δὴ καὶ [τῇ] γραφῇ τῇ θεῷ ἀνέθεσαν πάντων ὅσα τε ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσα ἔδρασαν). Chariton's novel ends with Kallirhoe's prayer to Aphrodite, after which the author concludes: “that is my story about Kallirhoe” (*Chaireas & Kallirhoe* 8.16: τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρρόης συνέγραψα). This, of course, reminds us of the *sphragis* of *H&H* (see above, p. 78). Paratextual devices in these and other fictional texts are discussed by Fusillo (1997) 212–214, who argues that they endow fiction with a sense of historiographic authenticity.

<sup>126</sup> Bartsch (1989) 168–170.

<sup>127</sup> Winkler (1989) 284.



## 2.2.3 Textual structure

Descriptive discourse plays an important role in *L&K* with all its digressive material, and in this chapter we will therefore concentrate on the text-type description.<sup>128</sup> The use of the two types of narrative, scene and summary, in *L&K* has been investigated in detail by Hägg. On the whole, Tatius has skillfully handled the alternation of slow, digressive development with rapid action, that is, the changes between the two types of narrative.<sup>129</sup> But also here does the text-type description play an important role, since Tatius tends to use digression to slow down the tempo instead of using scene, or rather combines the two. Let us, for example, look at the end of book 2, when the protagonists have eloped and are aboard the ship. The passage opens with scene describing the beginning of the journey (*L&K* 2.32). They meet the young man Menelaos (2.33), who tells his story (2.34). By the end of the paragraph, there is an elliptical report that Kleinias and Kleitophon too told their stories. They then engage in a discussion on homo- and heterosexual love (2.35–38). It opens as a dialogue (2.35), but then turns into three longer digressions on love.<sup>130</sup> The whole passage can of course be read as scene—it is reported in direct speech—but the material is digressive in that it is detached from the action. The book ends with the last digression, and book 3 opens with the elliptical *τρίτην δὲ ἡμέραν πλεόντων ἡμῶν ἐξ αἰθρίας πολλῆς*, “after three days of clear sailing” followed by a long passage of scene (3.1–4).

The construction becomes clearer if we consider the passage in comparison to the corresponding passage in *H&H* (7.7–16). Here the beginning of the journey is expressed in a short paragraph describing the first night on the ship, mixing summary and scene (7.7). The rest of the paragraph is all a long scene, and the rather long pieces of speech which are inserted do not digress from the current action, but concern only the present situation;<sup>131</sup> the same goes for the speeches of the captain (7.12.1–3 and 7.13.2).

It is easier to distinguish and draw a line between scene and summary in *L&K* than in *H&H*.<sup>132</sup> As we saw in chapter 1.2.3, Makrembolites changes frequently between scene and summary, often in a fluid manner which

<sup>128</sup> The earlier prevalent view of description as irrelevant discourse is no longer common; cf. e.g. Sedelmeyer (1959) with Nimis (1998). See also above, p. 84, n. 113.

<sup>129</sup> Hägg (1971a) 101–111.

<sup>130</sup> Menelaos in *L&K* 2.36 and 2.38; Kleitophon in 2.37.

<sup>131</sup> Hysmine in *H&H* 7.9 and 7.11; Hysminias in 7.10.

<sup>132</sup> Even though it is in general hard to specify the borderline between the two; Hägg (1971a) 87–88.

makes it hard for the reader to distinguish the two types. In *L&K* there is a strong correlation between the day-and-night phase and scene, and between the ignoring of the day-and-night frame and summary. That correlation emphasises the borderlines, and when the day-and-night frame is dropped, mainly during the period of adventure, rather than mixing the two types of narrative Tatius uses digression to change the tempo.<sup>133</sup>

#### EKPHRASEIS AND DREAMS

One of the problems with digressive material is to decide which text-type it belongs to: description or commentary? Digressions may be descriptive without being descriptions in their own right, but at the same time set piece descriptions are digressive. Descriptions may well form narratives in their own right, for example a description of a city or an animal. Digressions can also function as commentary, when they are used to comment upon some event in the narrative. It is common to refer to all digressive material as “digressions”, but that does not enable us to distinguish what type of material it consists of, and the digressions in *L&K* vary widely in subject matter and form.<sup>134</sup> The case is very different from *H&H*, where practically all the descriptions are of paintings or dreams.

Remarkably many of the digressions in *L&K* are placed in the first half of the novel. Only three of them are descriptions of works of art: the abduction of Europa (*L&K* 1.2–13), Andromeda and Prometheus (3.6–8), and Philomela, Prokne and Tereus (5.3.4–8). In *H&H* as well, almost all of the descriptions are placed in the first part of the novel.<sup>135</sup> It is a striking fact that both novels open with descriptions of cities (Sidon and Eurykomis respectively), despite the different narrative situations: the framing narrative in *L&K* versus the direct presentation of the hero-narrator in *H&H*.<sup>136</sup> If we compare the paintings in the two novels, Eros is the only motif that they share. The god has, however, been transferred by Makrembolites from one context to another, and into the garden.

Garden descriptions occur in both novels, and the ekphraseis are similar. This does not, however, mean that Makrembolites necessarily drew directly from Tatius, since garden ekphraseis occur in a number of ancient and By-

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Hägg (1971a) 101–103.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Anderson (1997) 2288–2291.

<sup>135</sup> *H&H* 1.1–2; 1.4–6; 2.2–9; 3.6; 4.5–16.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. also the opening description of Mytilene in Longus' *D&C* 1.1.1, which introduces the isle of Lesbos where the entire action of the novel takes place.



zantine authors.<sup>137</sup> The position of the garden description is different: in *H&H* it is placed in the beginning of book 1 (*H&H* 1.4.6), which stresses its importance in the plot and for the thematics; in *L&K* it appears later (*L&K* 1.15). Similar descriptions of the heroines appear in both novels, but their position too is different: in *L&K* the heroine is described at the first meeting (*L&K* 1.4.3); in *H&H* the description appears later (*H&H* 3.6). In contrast to the proleptic function of some descriptions in *L&K*,<sup>138</sup> the descriptions in *H&H* do not anticipate the action, but embody the novel's themes and actively stimulate the progress of Hysminias' development, thus being closely integrated into the plot.

The construction of the ekphraseis is very different in the two novels. In *H&H*, they are mixed with other kinds of discourse, forming an "emblematic" pattern of beholding–discussing–interpreting.<sup>139</sup> In *L&K* the descriptions are not as closely integrated with the narrative. The painting of Europa is commented upon by the viewer (*L&K* 1.2.1), but the painting of Prometheus and Andromeda is not followed by any remark from Kleitophon, apart from the typically ekphrastic comments *within* the description, commenting upon its paradoxical character. The painting of Philomela, Prokne, and Tereus is found in a slightly different context. It is described in detail, and Menelaos interprets it as a bad omen (5.4.1–2). Leukippe then asks Kleitophon to explain it to her, which he does by telling her the myth (5.5). This is, however, still far from the complex interaction of text-types in *H&H*. The difference is significant, since the integration of description and commentary with narrative in *H&H* emphasises the exegetic function of the narrator, and also of the characters.<sup>140</sup> This in its turn brings to the fore the artistic quality of the novel as a work of art that requires interpretation.

There are five dreams in *L&K*;<sup>141</sup> in *H&H* there are seven.<sup>142</sup> The dreams, which in *L&K* have a foreshadowing function similar to that of description, can in *H&H* be explained in terms of Aristotelian dream theory. Hysminias, as we remember, dreams about things he has seen or been thinking about during day-time.<sup>143</sup> There is only one dream in *L&K* that follows a similar

<sup>137</sup> See above, pp. 97–103, and below, pp. 209–213.

<sup>138</sup> See above, pp. 188–189.

<sup>139</sup> See above, pp. 85–87.

<sup>140</sup> Especially Kratisthenes, but also Hysminias. On the interpretations of the paintings, see above, pp. 127–128, 130–131, 162.

<sup>141</sup> *L&K* 1.3.4; 1.6.5; 2.23; 4.1.4; 4.1.5–8.

<sup>142</sup> *H&H* 3.1–2; 3.5–7; 5.1; 5.2; 5.3–4; 6.17–18; 7.18–19.

<sup>143</sup> See above, pp. 107–108 and (on dreams in *L&K*) pp. 188–189.

pattern: Kleitophon's erotic dream about Leukippe.<sup>144</sup> Kleitophon cannot sleep, his soul is attacked by the daily worries that are free to fester at night: τοῖς πενθοῦσιν αἱ λῦπαι, τοῖς μεριμνῶσιν αἱ φροντίδες, τοῖς κινδυνεύουσιν οἱ φόβοι, τοῖς ἐρώσιν τὸ πῦρ, "woes of the sorrowing, worries of the careworn, imperilled men's fears, the fires of men in love" (*L&K* 1.6.2–3).

περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑω μόλις ἐλεήσας μέ τις ὕπνος ἀνέπαυσεν ὀλίγον. 5 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τότε μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπελθεῖν ἤθελεν ἡ κόρη· πάντα γὰρ ἦν μοι Λευκίππη τὰ ἐνύπνια· διελεγόμην αὐτῇ, συνέπαιζον, συνεδείπνου, ἡπτόμην, πλείονα εἶχον ἀγαθὰ τῆς ἡμέρας· καὶ γὰρ κατεφίλησα, καὶ ἦν τὸ φίλημα ἀληθινόν· ὥστε ἐπειδὴ με ἤγειρεν ὁ οἰκέτης, ἐλοιδορούμην αὐτῷ τῆς ἀκαιρίας, ἀπολέσας ὄνειρον οὕτω γλυκύν. (*L&K* 1.6.4–5)

About dawn, a sleep of some sort took pity on me at last and gave me brief rest. But even then the girl would not leave my soul. All my dreams were of Leukippe. I spoke with her, played with her, ate with her, touched her—I had more good sensations than during the day. Yes, I even kissed her, and truly it was a kiss—so that when the servant roused me, I snapped at him for his untimely interruption that lost me so sweet a dream.

The passage may be compared to Hysminias' first dream about Hysmine (*H&H* 3.5–7). The two passages open similarly. Hysminias too lies sleepless: καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ πυρᾶς ὀπτούμενος (ἤμην) πυκνὰ στρεφόμενος, ὥσπερ τι θῦμα καινὸν ἐξωπτημένον τῷ Ἑρωτι, "I tossed and turned as though I was being roasted on coals, like some strange sacrifice being cooked up for Eros" (3.4.1). After some fantasising, he finally falls asleep. What Makrembolites does here is to amplify an episode drawn from Tatius: Hysminias' dream sequence is long and elaborate, describing in detail the speaking, playing, eating, touching, and kissing that Kleitophon only mentions briefly.<sup>145</sup> But that is not all. As we saw, Makrembolites also repeats his own text in a complex passage of repetition with variation.<sup>146</sup> Furthermore, the dream episode includes a description of Hysmine (*H&H* 3.6). Kleitophon described Leukippe's beauty before he dreamt about her (*L&K* 1.6.1), but Makrembolites has transferred his description of the girl to the dream sequence.<sup>147</sup> The result is a dense mimetic pattern where imitation of *L&K* is interwoven with "auto-mimesis" of his own text.

<sup>144</sup> Alexiou (1977) 40, n. 45.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 262–264 on the "thematic power" of amplification.

<sup>146</sup> See above, pp. 70–72.

<sup>147</sup> On the dream passage and its relation to Tatius, see MacAlister (1996) 137–139, who also discusses the dreams' possible connection with hagiography. On the descriptions of the heroines, see further below, pp. 251–252.



The dream seems to end with Hysminias' first orgasm (*H&H* 3.7.6–7); it is a so-called “wet dream”.<sup>148</sup> When he wakes up he is angry for having lost such a beautiful dream, καὶ ἡνιώμην νῆ τὸν Ἐρωτα οὕτω καλὸν ἀπολέσας ὄνειρον (3.7.7). This is a verbal echo of the way in which Tatius closed the dream of Kleitophon, and Makrembolites thus signals to the reader the “Tatian” background of the passage.<sup>149</sup> The “wet dream” as a motif is used also by another twelfth-century author. Manganeios Prodromos, in his poem 7 to Manuel I Komnenos, makes an analogy between the sexual frustration of a “wet dream” and his own frustration at Manuel's lack of co-operation with fundings.<sup>150</sup> A possible ancient source for the motif is a dream in Plutarch's *Life of Demetrius*, in which a man is cured from his desire for a beautiful courtesan by dreaming of her.<sup>151</sup>

Dreams are differently presented in the novels also on a textual level. All of Hysminias' dreams are narrated as they appear, and thus are fully integrated into the narrative, being presented almost as scene.<sup>152</sup> In *L&K* they are more loosely tied to the narrative by the way in which they are introduced. The reader is not informed when the first dream (*L&K* 1.3.4) appeared, only that Kleitophon was nineteen years old when it happened. The second dream (1.6.5) is narrated as Kleitophon experiences it. In that respect it is similar to Hysminias' dreams, but it is summarised and not at all as detailed. The third dream (2.23) is also narrated when it appears, but the narrator does so either in retrospect or with a break of the first-person viewpoint. This is the only explanation for Kleitophon's knowledge of the subject of Pantheia's dream at that point of the story. The last pair of dreams (4.1.4 and 4.1.5–8) are both narrated in retrospect. This means that, even though the dreams of Hysminias are more descriptive and much longer than the dreams in *L&K*, they are still more closely bound to narrative dis-

<sup>148</sup> Alexiou (1977) 41; MacAlister (1991) 200–201.

<sup>149</sup> MacAlister (1991) 201, who underlines the difference in the way the two statements are used: in *L&K* it emphasises the insignificance of the dream, in *H&H* the opposite; see also ead. (1996) 139.

<sup>150</sup> MacAlister (1991) 204, n. 88; poem 7 in Bernardinello (1972) 60–63. Manganeios Prodromos opens the poem with a warning that he may express himself in an outrageous manner, which, according to MacAlister, *ibid.*, may indicate that Makrembolites was criticised for his bold use of the dream (60.5: τολμηρῶς ἐρωτικὸν παράδειγμα παράγω). See also ead. (1990) 204 on the observations of Michael of Ephesos on “wet dreams”.

<sup>151</sup> Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius*, 27; MacAlister (1991) 204, n. 88. Cf. Cupane (2000) 48–49. The motif occurs also in hagiography, see e.g. the *Life of St Irene, Abbess of Chrysobalanton*, 53c; pp. 66–69 and p. 68, n. 2 in Rosenqvist (1986). A possible connection between *H&H* and the temptation dreams of Saints' lives was suggested by Alexiou (1977) 42.

<sup>152</sup> On the problematic status of dreams in a narrative, see above, pp. 84–85, 142.

course, whereas those of *L&K* are of a more digressive nature. There is most likely a connection here to the different character of dreams in Makrembolites' novel: Hysminias' dreams are all personal or erotic,<sup>153</sup> and the majority are related to art through the presence of Eros as depicted in the painting. There is thus in *H&H* an affinity between personal and artistic: the personal experiences of Hysminias are represented by means of both the painter's and the rhetor's craftsmanship.

The position of the dreams is the same as that of the paintings: in both novels they appear in the first parts. In *H&H*, the dream of Eros is placed at the opening of book 3 for dramatic effect, but no corresponding placing of dreams as markers can be seen in *L&K*. In *L&K* the descriptions of paintings and dreams are part of the internal reference system of anticipations and recapitulations.<sup>154</sup> In *H&H*, dreams and ekphraseis of paintings play an important role in Hysminias' erotic education—the paintings are closely related to the main theme of the novel, and the dreams express Hysminias' feelings before Eros and for Hysmine—and thus they both delay and advance the plot.

#### DIGRESSIONS: PARADOXOGRAPHY AND MYTHS

Most of the material in Tatius' digressions is not, with the exception of the garden ekphrasis (*L&K* 1.15), what we would call traditional novelistic subject matter. Besides traditional myth and fabula, he displays a whole bulk of encyclopedic material: a number of pseudoscientific explanations along with geographical, ethnographical and paradoxographical descriptions.<sup>155</sup> These digressions vary in length, and some of them are small narratives in their own right.<sup>156</sup> All are in different ways tied to the progress of the plot, and they are often placed in dialogue or during pauses in the intrigue as retardations of the action. In some cases they are placed at the end of books as internal closures, for example the legend of the Phoenix at the end of book 3, and that of the crocodile at the end of book 4. In contrast, the description of Alexandria is placed at the beginning of book 5 as an opening.<sup>157</sup> We can distinguish some pairing of digressions, such as the stories of Satyros and

<sup>153</sup> Alexiou (1977) 40.

<sup>154</sup> For example, Pantheia's dream in *L&K* 2.23 has a recapitulating function since it partly mirrors Kleitophon's dream of Kalligone (*L&K* 1.3.4). On anticipations and recapitulations in *L&K*, see above, pp. 186–188.

<sup>155</sup> Fusillo (1991) 67–76.

<sup>156</sup> Anderson (1997) 2288.

<sup>157</sup> On the ekphrasis of Alexandria, see Billault (1991) 36–38.



Konops respectively (2.21–22).<sup>158</sup> Also, digression tends to breed digression: one story leads to another, as in the case of the story of the hippopotamus, which leads to the myth of the elephant and the rose of India (4.2–5).<sup>159</sup>

Digressions in *L&K* may also be used as amorous incitements: Kleitophon uses erotic legends to catch the interest of Leukippe (*L&K* 1.16–19): βουλόμενος οὖν ἐγὼ εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι, λόγων πρὸς τὸν Σάτυρον ἡρχόμεν, “to lay the grounds for Leukippe’s more amorous inclination, I began speaking to Satyros” (1.16.1). He later points out that φιλόμυθον γάρ πως τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος, “there is something in the nature of women that dearly loves a tale” (5.5.1). Kleitophon himself is aroused by hearing the story of Daphne and Apollo (1.5.5), τοῦτό μοι μάλλον ἀσθεν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν· ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός, “this lyrical interlude fanned higher the fire in my soul, for stories of love stir feelings of lust” (1.5.5–6). Charmides narrates the stories of the hippopotamus and the elephant in order to be close to Leukippe:

ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ θηρίον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἴχομεν, ἐπὶ Λευκίππην δὲ ὁ στρατηγός· καὶ εὐθὺς ἐαλώκει. βουλόμενος οὖν ἡμᾶς παραμένειν ἐπὶ πλείστον, ἵν’ ἔχη τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ χαρίζεσθαι, περιπλοκάς ἐξήτει λόγων. (*L&K* 4.3.1–2).

While we were eyeing the animal, the general was eyeing Leukippe, and suddenly he was trapped. Desiring to prolong our presence as long as possible so he could feast his eyes on her, he searched out topics of conversation.

There is no such amount of digressive material in *H&H*. The vast paradoxographical material in *L&K* has in *H&H* been minimised into a few very short explanations. The legend of the male and the female palm is mentioned, or hinted at (*H&H* 10.3), and the legend of the Rhine (8.7.1) may have some connection with Tatiüs’ tales of Styx and/or Arethusa.<sup>160</sup> In book 8 there are the explanations of the nature of Artemis’ spring in Artykomis (8.7) and the origin of the city of Daphnepolis (8.18). At other places, potential points of

<sup>158</sup> Anderson (1997) 2283. Cf. also Segal (1984) on the pairing of complementary characters: Leukippe and Melite; Artemis and Aphrodite.

<sup>159</sup> Another example is the long series in *L&K* 2.14, where an oracle at Byzantium motivates a story of how volcanic soil fertilises the vine, which in its turn leads to a digression on the properties of water; Anderson (1997) 2289.

<sup>160</sup> On Arethusa, *L&K* 1.18.1–2; on Styx, *L&K* 8.12. Cf. Manasses’ *A&K*, fr. 21. On the legend of the palm, see below, pp. 235–236; on the Rhine, see above, p. 140, n. 344.

departure for paradoxographical digressions have been neglected.<sup>161</sup> In *H&H*, the mythical stories are not placed as markers in the beginnings or ends of books, and there is no pairing or doubling.

There are, however, traces of Tatius' pseudoscientific material on the properties and functions of love, such as the eyes as the source or channel of love,<sup>162</sup> lovers' eyes as a mirror of the beloved,<sup>163</sup> or lovers' inability to eat<sup>164</sup> or sleep.<sup>165</sup> The material is never displayed in exactly the same way in *H&H* as in *L&K*; there is always a transformation of some kind. We may, for example, look at the novels' respective passages on the eye as love's channel. In *L&K*, the process is described as a matter of fact: *κάλλος γὰρ ὁξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ· ὀφθαλμός γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῶ τραύματι*, "for Beauty's wound is sharper than any weapon's, and it runs through the eyes down to the soul. It is through the eyes that love's wound passes" (*L&K* 1.4.4). In *H&H*, on the other hand, the procedure is just briefly mentioned in the narrative: *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κατεφίλησα καὶ ὅλον εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνιμῆσάμην τὸν ἔρωτα· ὀφθαλμός γὰρ ἔρωτος πηγὴ*, "I kissed her eyes and drew all the love into my soul, for eyes are the source of love" (*H&H* 3.7.3).<sup>166</sup>

A similar treatment can be seen in the thematically close passages on loving eyes as a mirror of the beloved. The phenomenon is introduced in *L&K* 1.9.4, when Kleinias instructs Kleitophon in matters of love. It reappears a little later in 1.19.2: *ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐδόκει παρῆναι· ἀπελθοῦσα γὰρ τὴν μορφὴν ἐπαφῆκέ μου τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς*, "yet she seemed to stay with me, for as she left, she committed her features to my eyes."<sup>167</sup> In *H&H* the motif appears in different versions. Hysmine's eyes are described as a mirror for Eros (*H&H* 3.6.2), and in another variant the girl's image can be seen in the garden after she has left: *ὥς δ' οὐκ εἶχον ὁρᾶν (ᾧ χετο γάρ), ἐνεκαρτέρου τῷ κήπῳ, τὴν παρθένον ἐνοπτριζόμενος*, "when I could not see her (for she had left), I continued to linger in the garden, imagining the maiden"

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 229–235 on "excision"; see also below, p. 200, n. 170. We may compare this to Makrembolites' fellow novelist Manasses, who included a number of fabulous stories in his *A&K*; Hunger (1978) II, 128 and Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 79.

<sup>162</sup> *L&K* 1.4.4; *H&H* 3.7.3. On the connection to Plato's *Phaedrus* in this motif, see above, p. 181, n. 70. See also Jouanno (1994) 151–155.

<sup>163</sup> *L&K* 1.19.3; *H&H* 3.6.2; 4.4.3; 4.17.2; 5.11.6.

<sup>164</sup> *L&K* 1.5.3; 5.13.3; *H&H* 4.1.3.

<sup>165</sup> *L&K* 1.6.2–4; *H&H* 3.4; 4.25; 5.14. These motifs are *topoi* which occur in all the Komnenian novels.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Manganeios Prodromos' poem 45, "To Love"; see below, p. 208.

<sup>167</sup> The motif recurs in *L&K* 5.13.4.



(4.4.3).<sup>168</sup> In *L&K* some of the passages cover entire paragraphs (e.g. *L&K* 1.9.4 and 5.13.3–4), but in *H&H* they are always short and inserted into the narrative as commentary.

It seems that paradoxographical and pseudoscientific material was not of primary interest to Makrembolites, and that it was not imitated in *H&H* unless it either reflected philosophical reasonings, or had a significant function in relation to the plot.<sup>169</sup> In Makrembolites' novel such digressions have been replaced by an augmentation of ekphraseis and an inclusion of ethopoetic discourse, both of which were popular literary genres in the twelfth century.<sup>170</sup>

#### GENERAL STRUCTURE

While the plot of *L&K* may not seem very uniform—starting with psychological development and after violent adventures ending in a complicated intrigue—Tatius' novel does show a well-balanced structure.<sup>171</sup> Basically, the plot of the eight books can be organised into four pairs: (books 1–2) Kleitophon's courtship of Leukippe in Tyre; (books 3–4) adventures on the sea and in Egypt; (books 5–6) the sub-plot involving Melite in Alexandria and Ephesos; (books 7–8) the trials and the conclusion in Ephesos.<sup>172</sup> Although this division is based primarily on the plot, description and digressions have often been placed as markers at the beginnings and ends of books that open or close these "parts", so that the textual structure also underlines the structure of the plot. The length of the books varies a great deal, but the units are always carefully closed.<sup>173</sup>

The repetition of the first part of the story in the second part of the novel is an important structuring feature in *H&H*. This means that the story of the novel may be divided into two parts (books 1–5, 6–11).<sup>174</sup> But since

<sup>168</sup> The motif recurs in *H&H* 4.17.2 and 5.11.6.

<sup>169</sup> See esp. the conspicuous use of the palm legend in *H&H* 10.3; see below, pp. 235–236.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 229–245 on the three forms of reducing a text: "excision" (as above, p. 199, n. 161), "concision", and "condensation", of which the two latter concern us here. Concision, "whereby a text is abridged without the suppression of any of its significant thematic parts", is probably closest to Makrembolites' transformation of *L&K*. Cf. also *ibid.*, 210 on "generic reactivation".

<sup>171</sup> The narrative structure of *L&K* has been extensively analysed; see Sedelmeier (1959) esp. 113–131; Hägg (1971a) esp. 291–305; Reardon (1971) 360–367; Anderson (1997) 2279–2284.

<sup>172</sup> Anderson (1997) 2283.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. the "open closure" of the novel discussed above, pp. 189–191.

<sup>174</sup> Alexiou (1971) 30.

the period during which the protagonists are parted marks a break in both time and action, a threefold division may be preferable: (books 1–6) the couple falling in love; (books 7–8) the couple being parted; (books 9–11) the couple being reunited.<sup>175</sup> Structural balance is created mainly by an elaborate scheme of circular time and space, often using sleep as markers of internal episodes. The eleven books of *H&H* show the same closed composition as those of *L&K*; they never begin or end in the middle of an episode.<sup>176</sup>

Whereas Tattius uses descriptions and digressions to stress the novel's structure, Makrembolites' markers are more often time-related. However, dreams and descriptions may also in *H&H* mark beginnings or ends of episodes, and as we will see in chapter 2.2.5, temporal aspects are also used to structure *L&K*. Tattius' pairing of episodes, descriptions, and even characters is replaced in *H&H* by a threefold structure, particularly in the time scheme. The shifts from internal to external adventures (in *L&K* in book 3, and in *H&H* in book 7) are similar, but Makrembolites continues to concentrate on description of feelings and pathos more than does Tattius.<sup>177</sup>

The well-balanced structure of *L&K* has been further developed into the practically geometrical composition of *H&H*, which underlines the novel's artificial character. The story's emphasis on feelings correlates with the artistry in paintings and dreams, so that the personal and the artistic are bound together. An important aspect of the novel's aesthetics is that each detail is part of the unity: nothing that diverges from the overall literary strategy is included. There is a parallel to this in the symmetrical relation of the protagonists, who cannot escape their destiny, since it has been determined by Tyche through their names.<sup>178</sup>

## 2.2.4 Motifs and themes

Two different categories of motifs will be discussed in this section: firstly, I will consider motifs that we find in both Tattius and Makrembolites and that are also novelistic constants or *topoi* in general; secondly, I will investigate motifs that Makrembolites more obviously has drawn directly from Tattius, i.e. motifs expressed in passages that from a linguistic and literary point of view reflect a corresponding passage in *L&K*. Some of the novelistic stock conventions that are used in *H&H* have already been discussed or men-

<sup>175</sup> On the problematics involved in the division into parts of a narrative, see above, pp. 92–93.

<sup>176</sup> See above, pp. 93–95.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 330–335 on “transmotivation”.

<sup>178</sup> See above, pp. 156–157.



tioned: the garden; the presence of Eros, Tyche and other pagan gods; the protagonists becoming slaves; the dreaming; the protagonists' chastity being threatened (or not threatened, as with Hysmine) by other characters. Here we will return to two of them, Eros and the garden, and investigate two others: the storm/shipwreck and the chastity ordeal.

## EROS

Eros will here be considered in two respects: the iconography of Eros as described in *L&K* and in *H&H*, and the powers of Eros as experienced by Kleitophon and Hysminias respectively.<sup>179</sup> The outer appearance of Eros in *H&H* is similar to that in *L&K*, even though Tatius' description is shorter and less detailed. Eros is depicted on the votive tablet together with Europa and Zeus.

περὶ δὲ τὸν βοῦν ὠρχοῦντο δελφίνες, ἔπαιζον Ἑρωτες· εἶπες ἂν αὐτῶν ἐγγεγράφθαι καὶ τὰ κινήματα. Ἑρως εἶλκε τὸν βοῦν· Ἑρως, μικρὸν παιδίον, ἠπλώκει τὸ πτερόν, ἤρτητο φαρέτραν, ἐκράτει τὸ πῦρ· μετέστραπτο δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸν Δία καὶ ὑπεμειδία, ὥσπερ αὐτοῦ καταγελῶν, ὅτι δι' αὐτὸν γέγονε βοῦς. 2 Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὲν ἐπήνουν τῆς γραφῆς, ἅτε δὲ ὦν ἐρωτικὸς περιεργότερον ἐβλεπον τὸν ἄγοντα τὸν βοῦν Ἑρωτα· καὶ, 'Οἶον,' εἶπον, 'ἄρχει βρέφος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης.' (*L&K* 1.1.13–1.2.1)

Around the bull dolphins danced and Loves cavorted: you would have said their very movements were visibly drawn. And Eros was leading the bull: Eros, a tiny child, with wings spread, quiver dangling, torch in hand. He had turned to look at Zeus with a sly smile, as if in mockery that he had, for Love's sake, become a bull. Though the entire painting was worthy of admiration, I devoted my special attention to this figure of Eros leading the bull, for I have long been fascinated by passion, and I exclaimed, 'To think that a child can have such power over heaven and earth and sea.'

In Makrembolites' novel, Eros first appears when Kratisthenes and Hysminias explore the series of paintings on the garden wall. The passage was

<sup>179</sup> On the representation of Eros in ancient and Hellenistic art and literature, see Cupane (1974) 243, nn. 1–2, and 243–244 on the ancient novels; see also Effe (1993) on Eros in Greek poetry, and Paulsen (1993) on Eros in the ancient novel. Cupane, *ibid.*, 244–245, argues that Prodomos and Eugenianos follow the ancient novels, whereas Makrembolites displays a break with the Greek tradition; see also *ead.* (2000) 31 on the “return” of Eros in Eugenianos, who is more faithful to Heliodoros than is Prodomos. In the latter work by Cupane, two main aspects of Eros are investigated: how love arises, and the impersonation of Eros: Eros appears in *H&H* as a work of art, as a dream experience and as an acting person. Eros is a central theme in all the 12th-century novels, but he is described with varying iconography; see above, p. 35 and n. 146. For the treatment of Eros in later Byzantine romances, see Cupane (1974) 282–297.

quoted in chapter 1.2.4; here follows a short summary. Eros is painted next to the four Virtues, a naked youth seated on a splendid throne, with torch and bow, quiver and sword; his feet are like wings and his face is extremely beautiful. Around the throne stands a throng of people and animals, including Night and Day, all subjects to the enthroned king: *Eros basileus*. The ekphrasis is long and elaborate: it is filled with classical allusions and quotations, the descriptive discourse is mixed with dialogue as Kratisthenes and Hysminias discuss the meaning of the painting, and a supplementary inscription identifies the youth as Eros.

Makrembolites has transformed and expanded Tatius' passage on different levels.<sup>180</sup> Firstly, the introduction of Eros is delayed until book 2, the second day of the story. Other elements have been moved from the presentation of Eros to other parts of the novel: for example, the dolphins that are playing around the bull in *L&K* are in *H&H* still companions of Eros, but the first dolphin appears in book 9 (*H&H* 9.9.1) as the saviour of Hysminias.<sup>181</sup> Another element is the mockery of Eros, which is hinted by *L&K* in the smile of Eros (*L&K* 1.1.13), but in *H&H* both moved and expanded. Eros mocks Hysminias primarily in the first dream (*H&H* 3.1), where it also becomes clear that the god is more of a severe judge than the smiling *putto* described by Tatius.<sup>182</sup> The primary amplification, however, takes place already in the ekphrasis of the painting, as the powers of Eros are explicitly depicted in Makrembolites' iconography. In *L&K*, they are summarised in the short comment: οἶον ἄρχει βρέφος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, "to think that a child can have such power over heaven and earth and sea" (*L&K* 1.2.1). In *H&H* this power is represented by Eros' high throne and by the crowd standing around him.

Whereas Tatius' Eros was described as the traditional Hellenistic *putto*, Eros in *H&H* is no longer a baby boy (βρέφος), but a *μειράκιον*, a "teenager". In addition to the traditional attributes he carries a sword and is seated on a high throne. He now carries his wings at his feet, and no longer on his back.<sup>183</sup> The iconography implies both imperial and spiritual associations,

<sup>180</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) esp. chapters 53–55 on "extension", "expansion", and "amplification".

<sup>181</sup> On the dolphin, see below, pp. 233–234.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Cupane (1974) 265–266 on *Eros basileus* and the connections with Dieu d'Amour as a judge in the Western tradition.

<sup>183</sup> Traditionally, Eros carries his wings on his back. Cupane (1974) 255, n. 33, suggests a metaphorical sense related to the swiftness of love; cf. Hysminias' comment in *H&H* 4.21.1–2. See also Dostálová (1993) 50–51, who refers to Porphyry and Dionysius the Areopagite and their discussions on the meaning of the wings of Zeus and angels respectively. Dionysius the Areopagite interprets the wings of angels as a symbol of swift-



with the enthroned youth as both emperor and Christ.<sup>184</sup> There are a number of Byzantine representations of emperors that share Makrembolites' iconography,<sup>185</sup> one of the most striking being a description of Alexios I Komnenos in the twelfth-century *Life of Saint Cyril Phileotes* by Nikolaos Kataskepenos.<sup>186</sup> The appearance and age of Eros in Makrembolites' ekphrasis gave rise to Cupane's study of Western influence, since she saw a break with the earlier Greek tradition.<sup>187</sup> However, the discussion of Eros' status as at the same time the youngest and oldest of gods goes back to antiquity. In Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe* (2.3–7), Eros is certainly described as a child (παῖς), but he explains that he is not: οὐ τοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ παντὸς χρόνου, "I am not really a boy, even though I look like one, but I'm even older than Cronus and the whole of time itself."<sup>188</sup> The transformation of Eros into a μεῖρά-

ness and movability, and he ascribes them winged feet. See also Magdalino (1992) 199 on the wings of Eros as inspired by the six-winged angels, *hexapteryga*, of religious iconography.

<sup>184</sup> It was argued by Magdalino (1992) that the iconography of Eros in Makrembolites was influenced by the contemporary discussion of Eros and his powers, and thus reflected the court around the emperor Manuel I Komnenos, referred to as the βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐρώτων in contemporary literature. Although new evidence has shown that the dating and context argued by Magdalino probably are wrong, the connection to 12th-century court poetry on Eros is still significant, even if *Eros basileus* does not literally represent Manuel; see above, p. 17 and n. 39, and p. 104. For a spiritual-philosophical interpretation, see Dostálová (1993) 50–51, who interprets the throne according to the Neoplatonic tone exhibited by the ekphrasis; according to Dionysius the Areopagite, the throne means firm power and immovability. Byzantine iconography in representations of mythological figures appeared early, and was fully developed by the 12th century; see Weitzmann (1951); Agapitos (1990) 270, n. 54.

<sup>185</sup> Magdalino (1992) esp. 199–200; see also Magdalino & Nelson (1982).

<sup>186</sup> *Vit. Cyr. Phil.* 36; pp. 154 and 381 in Sargologos (1964): καὶ ἀτενίζων ἐνθεν κακέειθεν ὁρῶ ἐν μὲν τῷ δεξιῷ μέρει σκηπὴν βασιλικὴν σχῆμα ἐκκλησίας ἔχουσαν καὶ πλῆθος στρατιωτικοῦ λαοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ ἔσωθεν αὐτῆς καθήμενον τὸν βασιλέα ἐπὶ θρόνου ὑψηλοῦ καὶ βασιλικοῦ, "regardant autour de moi, je remarque, à droite, une tente impériale qui a la forme d'une église, entourée d'une foule de soldats; à l'intérieur, l'empereur est assis sur un trône élevé et impérial." Most significant in relation to *H&H* is the narrative frame: the saint sees the emperor in a dream vision; MacAlister (1991) 204–205. There are indeed interesting affinities between *H&H* and the *Life of Saint Cyril*, which deserve some attention (they will not, however, be discussed in this study); see e.g. also above, p. 104 and n. 206, on Kataskepenos' use of the same maxim as Makrembolites. Kataskepenos also draws material from *L&K* and the *Aithiopika*; see above, p. 28, n. 98. Expressions in the *Life* and in *H&H* are sometimes very similar; cf. e.g. *Vit. Cyr. Phil.* 5.9 with *H&H* 2.14.4–5. On the style of and the quotations in the *Vit. Cyr. Phil.*, see Sargologos (1964) 32–37; note esp. p. 33 on accumulation and repetition.

<sup>187</sup> Cupane (1974).

κίου in *H&H* should perhaps also be seen in relation to the imperial iconography: a little child would look strange on the brilliant throne and be hard to associate with the emperor.

It may be worthwhile here to pay some attention to a less known Greek novel that has survived only in fragments: the *Metiochos & Parthenope*.<sup>189</sup> Although it survives only in two fragmentary columns, it seems to have enjoyed a quite extensive *Nachleben*, of which a Persian adaptation in verse from the twelfth century is the most significant example: the *Vāmiq and 'Adhrā* by the poet 'Unṣurī.<sup>190</sup> In the Greek fragments, we can see that the novel includes a philosophical inquiry (τὴν φιλοσόφου ζήτησιν, column 2) into the nature of Eros at a symposium: the male protagonist first describes the god in the traditional manner as a child, but then dismisses that representation as absurd (γέλως) in favour of a more scientific explanation, "love rather is a stirring of the mind aroused by beauty and increasing with familiarity."<sup>191</sup> Metiochos himself says that he has not yet experienced Eros and wishes that he never will.<sup>192</sup> Parthenope gets upset with him and enters the discussion; at this point the fragment ends. The few words that are left indicate, however, that she embarks upon a defence of the traditional portraits of Eros by poets, painters and sculptors.<sup>193</sup>

There is no evidence that suggests a relationship between *H&H* and the Persian version of *Metiochos & Parthenope*, but it cannot be excluded that a

<sup>188</sup> Longus combines the conception of Eros as a cosmic force from Hesiod's *Theogony* 120–122 with the portrayal of Eros in poetry and art; cf. Platos' *Symposium*. Cf. also Basilakes' *progymn.* 51.32–33: ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ Διὸς προπάτωρ καὶ Κρόνου ἀρχαιότερος καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀρχαιογονώτερος, "for I am the forefather of Zeus himself and older than Kronos and of older descent than Uranos"; p. 209 in Pignani (1983). The full title of the ethopoeia is: Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Ἔρως, ἰδὼν δρυτόμον ἐπιχειροῦντα τέμνειν τὴν Μύρραν ἔτι ἐγκυμονοῦσαν τὸν Ἀδωνιν, "What Eros would say on seeing a woodcutter on the point of cutting down Myrrha while she is pregnant with Adonis."

<sup>189</sup> Stephens & Winkler (1995) 72–94 with discussion, English translation and commentary. This novel can possibly be placed as early as the first century B.C.; Hägg (1987).

<sup>190</sup> The poem was edited by Shafi (1967) with an English preface, pp. 1–8, and partial translation. On the poem, see Utas (1984/86). On the Greek text and its relation to the Persian version, see Hägg (1984, 1985, 1989). Utas and Hägg are preparing a joint edition of the Greek and Persian material. I take this opportunity to thank Professor Hägg for turning my attention to the *Parthenope* novel, and Professor Utas for making his English translation of the Persian text available to me before its publication.

<sup>191</sup> *M&P*, column 2, 60–62: Ἔρως | [δ' ἔστ]ιν κίνημα διανοίας ὑπὸ [κ]άλλους γινόμε | [νον] καὶ ὑπὸ συνηθείας αὐξόμενον. Cf. *L&K* 1.9.5.

<sup>192</sup> *M&P*, column 2, 59–60: ἐγὼ | [δέ γ' οὐ]πω—μηδὲ πειραθείην τὸ σύνολον. Cf. Hysminias' "may I never know him" in *H&H* 2.11.3.

<sup>193</sup> *M&P*, column 2, 69–71.



manuscript of the Greek novel may have still existed in Byzantium.<sup>194</sup> The central issue is, however, that the imagery of Eros, the descriptions of his influence, and even the narrative framing with symposia or banquets, all go back to the same ancient tradition that is expressed in the dialogues of Plato and in the Hellenistic *erotikoi logoi*.<sup>195</sup> The ekphrasis by Psellos on the statue of the sleeping Eros indicates that the innate ambiguity of Eros, as a cosmic/philosophical force and as a *putto*, was still (or once more) discussed in Byzantium.<sup>196</sup> Psellos opens the ekphrasis with a discussion of the philosophical-Platonic aspects of Eros (1–30), abounding in reminiscences of the *Phaedrus*.<sup>197</sup> He then moves on to an objective description of the statue (31–56).<sup>198</sup> This part of the description is designed as a traditional ekphrasis, complete with addressee (ὦ μείράκιον), emphasis on and praise of the artist and his artistry, contrasting and at the same time equating art and nature, and on the whole a wish to make the depicted object vivid before the eyes of the reader, who then becomes the beholder.<sup>199</sup>

Representations of outer and inner aspects of Eros and love are accordingly both in antiquity and in Byzantium closely linked together, and in *H&H* the iconography of the god expresses his particular characteristics: he is a ruthless king, who rules his world without mercy, his subjects literally being his slaves. He appears in person before the protagonists: to Hysminias only in dreams, but to Hysmine as an acting saviour. He gives orders that cannot be disobeyed.<sup>200</sup> In *L&K*, Eros is more of a physical power that can be explained, like all other feelings, in terms of bodily fluids and move-

<sup>194</sup> Eustathios of Thessalonike, in his comment upon a geographical poem by Dionysius the Periegete, was obviously familiar with Parthenope; Stephens & Winkler (1995) 77–78. There are indeed some similarities between *H&H* and *W&A*, e.g. the description of and setting at banquets, or the characterisation of the heroine as strong and intelligent.

<sup>195</sup> Cf. Dostálová (1993) 46, who mentions *M&P*, but repudiates any relation between the texts. On the Platonic dialogues and *erotikoi logoi*, see above, p. 182.

<sup>196</sup> Ἐκφρασις εἰς ἔρωτα ἐγγεγλυμμένον λίθῳ, “Ekphrasis concerning [a statue of] Eros carved in stone”; no. 34 in Littlewood (1985) 129–131. Cf. Cupane (2000) 39 and 46–47.

<sup>197</sup> See the *apparatus fontium* in Littlewood (1985).

<sup>198</sup> Cf. the traditional iconography of Eros in Tzetzes, *Chil.* 5, hist. 11, 502–511; pp. 186–187 in Leone (1968).

<sup>199</sup> On the ekphrasis and the reading of it as an allegorical interpretation of Eros, see Dostálová (1993) 51.

<sup>200</sup> On eroticism in *H&H*, see Alexiou (1977) 42; Garland (1990) 70–81, with the objections by Agapitos & Smith (1992) 61 n. 148; Tonnet (1992) 47–50. Cf. Odorico (1997), who argues that there is no true expression of love in Byzantium before the appearance of the Palaiologan romance.

ments. He is perceived by Kleitophon rather as some kind of inner voice.<sup>201</sup> But also in *L&K* the protagonists may be referred to as slaves to Eros, even if the god does not appear in person to force them into bondage.<sup>202</sup> Makrembolites has used amplification, bringing to the fore the imperial iconography and the cosmic, although not necessarily tyrannical, powers of Eros.

It may be useful to consider representations of Eros also in other ancient novels. Eros in *H&H* can, for example, be compared to Eros of the *Ephesiaka*: when he sees the hero Habrokomes laughing at him, like Hippolytus, he takes a revenge that triggers the falling in love of the protagonists and thus the whole story.<sup>203</sup> We have noted above how Hysminias himself indeed acted like a Hippolytus in the beginning of the story.<sup>204</sup> We should also recall the mischievous little Eros of Longus, who may not be a king, but rules his rustic paradise with a firm hand. It is Philetas, a herdsman-musician, who tells the young couple of Eros as he appears in his garden:

θεός ἐστιν, ὦ παῖδες, ὁ Ἔρως, νέος καὶ καλὸς καὶ πετόμενος· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ νεότητι χαίρει καὶ κάλλος διώκει καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀναπτέροι. 2 Δύναται δὲ τοσοῦτον ὅσον οὐδὲ ὁ Ζεὺς. Κρατεῖ μὲν στοιχείων, κρατεῖ δὲ ἀστρῶν, κρατεῖ δὲ τῶν ὁμοίων θεῶν· οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς τοσοῦτον τῶν αἰγῶν καὶ τῶν προβάτων. 3 Τὰ ἄνθη πάντα Ἔρωτος ἔργα· τὰ φυτὰ ταῦτα τοῦτου ποιήματα· διὰ τοῦτου καὶ ποταμοὶ ῥέουσιν καὶ ἄνεμοι πνέουσιν. (*D&C* 2.7.1–3)

Love is a god, my children; he is young, beautiful, and winged; and so he enjoys youth, pursues beauty, and makes souls take wing. 2 Zeus has not so much power as he has: he rules the elements; he rules the stars; he rules his fellow gods—more completely than you rule your goats and sheep. 3 All the flowers are the work of

<sup>201</sup> Alexiou (1977) 33; Cupane (2000) 41, n. 101.

<sup>202</sup> E.g. *L&K* 2.24, 7.2.26 and 5.25.6; see also *Eph.* 1.2.2. Cf. Smith (1980) 541–542, 548. See also Cupane (1974) 251, n. 24 on the motif of Eros' powers in antiquity, where he may appear as a tyrant, but never as an emperor, and ead. (2000) 32 on *Eros tyrannos*.

<sup>203</sup> Ἐρωτά γε μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι θεόν, ἀλλὰ πάντη ἐξέβαλεν ὡς οὐδὲν ἡγούμενος, λέγων ὡς οὐκ ἂν ποτε οὐ(δὲ) εἰς ἐρασθείη οὐδὲ ὑποταγείη τῷ θεῷ μὴ θέλων, "he did not even recognize Eros as a god; he rejected him totally and considered him of no importance, saying that no one would ever fall in love or submit to the god except of his own accord" (*Eph.* 1.1.5). Trans. by Anderson in Reardon (1989).

<sup>204</sup> See *H&H* 1.9.4, 2.11.3, 2.14.6, and then the revenge of Eros in the dream in *H&H* 3.1–2; see above, p. 125. The Hippolytan *hybris* in Xenophon was noted by Egger (1994) 265; cf. the remarks by Smith (1980) 546, n. 15 and (1999) 178–179, 189–191. It seems probable that the 12th-century novelists were familiar also with the *Ephesiaka*; see above, p. 174. There are a few other elements in *H&H* that may derive from the *Eph.*: the immodesty of the heroine (Alexiou [1977] 36), the description of the religious feast at which the protagonists meet (but cf. also the *Aith.*), and Rhodope—the threat to Hysminias' chastity—being a young girl, the daughter of the house as Manto in the *Eph.*, rather than an older, experienced woman. See also n. 202 above on slavery to Eros.



Love; all the plants are his creations; thanks to him, the rivers flow, the winds blow.<sup>205</sup>

Like *Eros basileus*, this god dwells in a garden, where he plays among the myrtles and pomegranates.<sup>206</sup> At least two elements in this passage indicate that Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe* is a complementary hypotext of *H&H* alongside *L&K*. Firstly, Longus' Eros makes souls take wing, as does indeed Eros in *H&H*.<sup>207</sup> Secondly, the power of Eros is contrasted with that of Zeus: Eros rules his fellow gods and everything else (*D&C* 2.7.2). In addition, we must keep in mind the emphasis on art and artistry in *H&H*: the simultaneous equation and rivalry of art and nature, picture and discourse, that has such a clear parallel in Longus.<sup>208</sup>

In the twelfth-century author Nikephoros Basilakes, Eros is represented as a negative and destructive force, but with a traditional iconography.<sup>209</sup> In another twelfth-century representation, the poem *Εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα*, "To Love", by Manganeios Prodromos, love is described, with a twist of the Platonic Eros, as an inner force of the human soul. Love enters the heart through the eye, but without hurting it.<sup>210</sup> Against the background of the ancient and Hellenistic tradition, Psellos' ekphrasis, Manganeios Prodromos' poem, and also Makrembolites' novel represent new, but in my view not surprising or radical, departures of erotic disputes.<sup>211</sup> In *H&H* the god's destructive powers are fused with the more tender aspects, so as to display love's multiple character. The fusion concerns both traditional and contemporary aspects against the background of the ancient novel and philosophical genres. *L&K* is indeed always there as a hypotext, but so are a significant number of other texts, intertexts that Makrembolites alludes to.<sup>212</sup>

<sup>205</sup> Trans. by Gill in Reardon (1989).

<sup>206</sup> On Eros in *D&C*, see e.g. Chalk (1960) and Hunter (1983) 31–38. There are also a number of studies of *D&C* concentrating on the garden; see e.g. Forehand (1976), Zeitlin (1990), and Alpers (1996) 328–329.

<sup>207</sup> See *H&H* 4.21.1–2, and cf. above, p. 203, n. 183.

<sup>208</sup> We have also considered earlier the initial description of a city, and below we will look at the garden motif. We can surely assume that Makrembolites was familiar with Longus. His fellow novelist Eugenianos' dependence upon Longus' *D&C* is well documented; Kazhdan (1967); Hunger (1978) II, 133–136; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 76–78.

<sup>209</sup> Basilakes' *Progymn.* 46–48, 51 and 54; see Cupane (2000) 33–35 on Basilakes.

<sup>210</sup> For the text, see Petta (1993) and Polemis (1996); Petta's edition is criticised by Cupane (2000) 36, n. 77. On Manganeios, see Cupane (2000) 34–39 and Magdalino (1992) 200–202; on poem 45, Cupane (2000) 36–39 and Magdalino (1992) 200.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Cupane (2000) 39, 46–47.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 269–277 on ambiguous usage of transformation devices.

## THE GARDEN

We have already, in chapter 1.2.4, studied the garden as a novelistic *topos* in *H&H*. We concluded that it has an external aspect through the description of the highly artificial fountain, and that it is closely linked to other motifs of the novel. In fact, the main motifs are all expressed *within* the garden motif through the series of paintings. The traditional *topos* has thus gained a particular significance by means of its special characteristics—the links not only to the heroine, but also to main events and motifs.

If we compare the outer aspects of the gardens in Makrembolites and Tatius, that of Sosthenes looks much like that of Hippias: it is filled with trees and flowers, the trees protecting the flowers with their branches intertwined as a roof, and the sun shining down through the branches casting shadows on the ground. The descriptions in *L&K* are, however, less detailed and complex than those in *H&H*. For example, the description of the sun's effect in Tatius' version is brief: τῶν δὲ φύλλων ἄνωθεν αἰωρουμένων ὑφ' ἡλίου πρὸς ἄνεμον συμμιγῇ ὥχραν ἐμάρμαιρεν ἡ γῆ τὴν σκιάν, "when the highest, sunlit leaves fluttered in the wind the earth took on a dappled look, with yellow patches in the shade" (*L&K* 1.15.4). In *H&H*, there are no verbal echoes of Tatius' passage, but some aspects of the "Tatian" garden have been elaborated:

δάφνη γὰρ καὶ μυρρίνη καὶ κυπάριττος καὶ ἄμπελοι καὶ τὰλλα τῶν φυτῶν [...] ἐφαπλοῦσι τοὺς κλάδους ὡς χεῖρας καὶ ὥσπερ χορὸν συστησάμενα κατοροφοῦσι τὸν κήπον, ἐς τοσοῦτον δὲ τῷ ἡλίῳ παραχωροῦσι προκύψαι περὶ τὴν γῆν, 4 ἐς ὅσον ὁ ἔμφυρος πνεύσας τὰ φύλλα διέσεισεν. (*H&H* 1.4.3–4)

For laurel and myrtle and cypresses and vines and all the other plants [...] spread out their branches like hands and seemed to be setting up a dance; they roofed over the garden, but they permitted the sun to peer over the earth 4 only as long as the zephyr blew and rustled the leaves.

The intertwining of the trees' branches is described in a similarly intricate manner in *H&H*: τὰς κλῖνας μυρρίναι πάντοθεν περιέσκεπον εὐφυῶς ἀνατεταμέναι, πρὸς ἀλλήλας συνδούμεναι καὶ πρὸς ὄροφον οἶον ἀπευθυνόμεναι, "myrtles, cleverly trained upwards, overshadowed the couches on all sides, intertwined with each other and shaped as it were into roofing" (*H&H* 1.6.2).<sup>213</sup> In *L&K* we find the more concise: ἔθαλλον οἱ κλάδοι, συνεπίπτου ἀλλήλοις ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλον· γείτονες αἱ τῶν πετάλων περι-

<sup>213</sup> See also *H&H* 1.4.1: αἱ μυρρίναι κατὰ στέγην συνηρεφεῖς, "the myrtles formed a dense covering".



πλοκαί, “a network of sturdy branches interlaced to form an intricate pattern wherein petals gently embraced their neighbors” (*L&K* 1.15.2).<sup>214</sup>

The meadow described in the ekphrasis of Europa (*L&K* 1.1.3–6) shows a greater similarity to the description of Makrembolites, with the same intertwined branches and the sun shining down through them:

ἔγραφεν ὁ τεχνίτης ὑπὸ τὰ πέταλα καὶ τὴν σκιάν, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἡρέμα τοῦ  
λειμῶνος κατὰ σποράδην διέρρει, ὅσον τὸ συνηρεφές τῆς τῶν φύλλων κόμης  
ἀνέωξεν ὁ γραφεύς. (*L&K* 1.1.4)

The artist had sketched the shadows cast below the leaves, and sunshine filtered in soft splashes onto the meadow through fissures left by the artificer in the leaves above.

The fact that the meadow is described before the main garden may have played a role; as we have mentioned earlier, the first part of a literary work is most often the part that is imitated in detail.<sup>215</sup> The meadow is also more directly connected with Eros than is Hippias’ garden. We should note here the peculiar duplication of gardens in *L&K*: the painted meadow described in the opening ekphrasis (*L&K* 1.1.3–6) is a doublet of the real garden in Tyre (*L&K* 1.15.1–8). According to Bartsch, the duplication strengthens the associations between the heroine Leukippe and Europa: both are abducted from their respective gardens.<sup>216</sup> In *H&H*, there is just one garden, but it contains both nature and art in abundance.<sup>217</sup>

As to the contents of the gardens, they do not contain exactly the same plants: both have grapevine, the violet, and the rose. Makrembolites has replaced the narcissus by the lily, and there is no ivy in Sosthenes’ garden, but laurels, cypresses, and plenty of myrtle.<sup>218</sup> The simple square basin in the centre of Tatius’ garden has been transformed by Makrembolites into an

<sup>214</sup> Cf. also Longus’ *D&C* 4.2: ἐν μετεώρῳ δὲ οἱ κλάδοι συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἐπήλλαττον τὰς κόμας· ἐδόκει μέντοι καὶ ἡ τούτων φύσις εἶναι τέχνη, “but, higher up, the branches joined and intertwined their foliage. This was the work of nature, but it also seemed to be the work of art.” On the erotic imagery in these passages, see Littlewood (1979) 101.

<sup>215</sup> See above, p. 191.

<sup>216</sup> Bartsch (1989) 50–55.

<sup>217</sup> There are two gardens also in Longus, *D&C* 2.3–7 (Philetas’ garden) and 4.2 (Dionysophanes’ garden), of which the one is “natural”, the other “artistic”.

<sup>218</sup> The rose is a symbol of, among other things, erotic love. The trees represent different aspects of love: the laurel is a symbol of chastity; the cypress is reminiscent of Aphrodite; the myrtle is a symbol of love and marriage. On the imagery of rose and laurel, see above, pp. 114–116. Cf. also the plants in Longus’ *D&C* 4.2: myrtle, cypress, laurel; rose, lily, and violet (among many others).

exquisite fountain with statues and Byzantine *automata*.<sup>219</sup> Although both gardens are described in traditional ekphraseis, modelled upon the garden of Alcinous in the *Odyssey*, Sosthenes' garden is explicitly linked to the Homeric tradition as Hysminias says: "seeing this, I thought I beheld Alcinous' garden and felt that I could not take as fiction the Elysian plain so solemnly described by the poets" (*H&H* 1.4.3).<sup>220</sup> The garden of Alcinous is the ekphrastic garden *par excellence*; Makrembolites thus seems to emphasise something that the reader is supposed to already know.<sup>221</sup> The garden of Sosthenes is thus more than just a garden, and more than an imitation of the garden in *L&K*.<sup>222</sup> Above all it is the abode of *Eros basileus*,<sup>223</sup> but it is also a sort of gallery with statues and paintings which are described by another artist: the rhetorician.<sup>224</sup> Furthermore, it is a direct link both to the Homeric heritage and to the heavens, which Hysminias shows by saying "Sosthenes, you have woven me a golden chain" (*H&H* 1.4.4).<sup>225</sup> This alludes to the golden chain that in the *Iliad* links heaven and earth,<sup>226</sup> but it also evokes the whole *aurea catena Homeri* of Neoplatonism.<sup>227</sup>

<sup>219</sup> See above, pp. 101–103. Cf. also the corresponding, but less detailed, description in Eugenianos' *D&C* 1.77–108.

<sup>220</sup> Quoted in Greek above, p. 86; see also p. 100.

<sup>221</sup> Cf. Basilakes' *progymn.* 26.3: τὸν Ἀλκινόου κήπον ἐκηπευσάμην αὐτὸν, "I cultivated the very garden of Alcinous"; p. 225 in Pignani (1983). Note that the reference to Alcinous appears in the very beginning of the text, and not, as in *H&H*, after the description that would have already reminded the reader of Homer. On this ethopoeia, see further below, pp. 212–213 and n. 233. On the function of the Homeric allusions, see further below, pp. 263–264.

<sup>222</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 367–375 on "transvaluation".

<sup>223</sup> One may note here that imperial power in the 12th century was described as a garden by John Syropoulos; Kazhdan (1983) 20.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 65–68 on art and nature, and Cupane (2000) 3 on the representation of Eros as in a "Philostatic gallery".

<sup>225</sup> Quoted in Greek above, p. 86.

<sup>226</sup> *Il.* 8.19: σειρήν χρυσείην ἐξ οὐρανόθεν πεδιόονδε.

<sup>227</sup> Cf. Plato, *Theaet.* 153c; Euripides *Or.* 982; Alexiou (1977) 37 and n. 33. Cf. also the entry in the *Suda*, *Χ* 564: χρυσήν σειρήν· οὕτως ὑπὸ Ὀμήρου τὸν ἥλιον λεγόμενον ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ Πλάτων φησί. The allegorical tradition of the *aurea catena* held a central position in Byzantine Homeric studies. Psellos wrote a treatise on it from a Neoplatonist perspective, *Περὶ τῆς χρυσοῦς ἀλύσεως τῆς παρ' Ὀμήρῳ*, "On the golden chain in Homer"; no. 46 in Duffy (1992) 164–168. On the treatise and its place in the Byzantine tradition, see Lévêque (1959) 10 and 52, with a French translation of the treatise in pp. 78–81. Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* on *Il.* 8.19, departs from ancient interpretations of the myth, and his comments are, according to Lévêque, marked by Stoicism; *ibid.* 10–11 and 11, n. 2. See also, in the same century, the interpretation of Tzetzes in his *Allegory on the Iliad* on *Il.* 8; pp. 124–134 in Boissonade (1967). On Tzetzes' allegories, see Hunger (1954) and above, p. 31, n. 123.



We need to return to the novel of Longus and its two gardens. Philetas' garden (*D&C* 2.3–7) is the playground of Eros; Dionysophanes' garden (*D&C* 4.2) has in its centre a temple with walls decorated by paintings dedicated to Dionysos.<sup>228</sup> In *H&H*, the two gardens of Longus, and also the two gardens of *L&K*, are fused; that is, the garden of Sosthenes, as we have already seen, contains both the erotic and the artistic aspects. In support of the claim that Makrembolites used Longus as a second hypotext, we may note that by the end of book 3 of *Daphnis & Chloe*—right before the description of Dionysophanes' garden in the beginning of book 4—there is an allusion to the Judgement of Paris. After a description of the abundance of fruit and apples, and of one apple still left on a branch,<sup>229</sup> Daphnis plucks this last apple for Chloe, and delivers a little speech that closes in the following manner:

Τοῦτο Ἀφροδίτῃ κάλλους ἔλαβεν ἄθλον· τοῦτο ἐγὼ σοὶ δίδωμι νικητήριον.  
Ὅμοίους ἔχετε τοὺς μάρτυρας· ἐκείνος ἦν ποιμήν, αἰπόλος ἐγώ. (*D&C* 3.34.2–3)

Aphrodite took this as a prize for her beauty; and I am giving it to you as a prize for your victory. You have the same kind of witness of your beauty as she had: he was a shepherd, while I'm a goatherd.

Makrembolites employs the same mythological motif in his description of one of the garden's paintings: that of the young and beautiful Eros (*H&H* 2.7.4). In Hysminias description, Eros is so beautiful that one has to imagine Thetis' wedding and the contest in order to understand the full impact of his beauty.<sup>230</sup> The judgement of Paris is never mentioned in *L&K*, but it is used by Eugenianos, who was greatly influenced by Longus.<sup>231</sup>

The motif was popular in both ancient and Byzantine tradition.<sup>232</sup> In the twelfth century it appears, for example, in one of Basilakes' ethopoeiae, "What a gardener would say on the care of a garden, after having transplanted a cypress in the hope of fruit and not having achieved his end."<sup>233</sup>

<sup>228</sup> Paintings on walls of temples or other buildings are a common motif of ekphraseis in the Second Sophistic, employed by Lucian, Philostratus and also Tatius: Europa and the bull (*L&K* 1.1); Andromeda and Prometheus (*L&K* 3.7–8).

<sup>229</sup> The passage is based on Sappho fr. 105 LP, where the apple seems to be a simile for the beloved. In Longus, an analogy is made between the apple and Chloe.

<sup>230</sup> Quoted above, pp. 103–104.

<sup>231</sup> Eugenianos' *D&C* 2.284–287. On the Judgement of Paris in Byzantine literature, see Littlewood (1974) 41–46; Jeffreys (1978).

<sup>232</sup> Littlewood (1974) 41–46.

<sup>233</sup> Basilakes, *progymn.* 26 (Τίνας ἂν εἶπη λόγους κηπωρός, κήπου ἐπιμελούμενος καὶ μεταφυτευσάμενος καὶ κυπάριττον ἐπ' ἐλπίδι καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ἐλπίδων ἀστοχή-

The gardener grows apples that are perfect and beautiful; his apple, he says, could be the one given by Paris to Aphrodite.<sup>234</sup> His skill lies in being able to control the time at which the fruit ripens; the cypress, however, never bears fruit, no matter how much care he devotes to it. In the Judgement of Paris, the symbolism of the apple is erotic. The fruit is from antiquity onward associated with flirtation and marriage.<sup>235</sup> The fruit bears, however, also other connotations in the Byzantine period: those to the orb as a symbol of the earth and thus the universe, i.e. the orb of potentates (the *Reichsapfel*).<sup>236</sup> John Geometres wrote three *encomia* on the apple, of which the third describes the apple as a symbol of dominion over the world.<sup>237</sup> Since Eros in *H&H* is represented as a king/emperor, it is possible that the meaning of the apple is a double one. In relation to the explicit identification of the orb of Phronesis as “encompassing the universe”,<sup>238</sup> the apple that Hysminias would give to Eros may not be just the apple of the myth, but also the apple of power.

#### THE STORM

We have already noted that an important difference between *L&K* and *H&H* is the treatment of the heroines: while Leukippe is constantly threatened, Hysmine never is. While Leukippe apparently dies three times—twice in a violent manner—Hysmine is once sacrificed to Poseidon. Although the sacrifice of Hysmine has no evident parallel in *L&K*, there are “Tatian” echoes in the episode, of which the most evident is the sea journey itself.

The episode opens, in both novels, with fair wind and pleasant sailing, after the obligatory prayers to Poseidon.<sup>239</sup> In *H&H*, the ship is described as a couch for lovers, and the protagonists kiss and embrace.

σας) pp. 225–228 in Pignani (1983). For an analysis of this ethopoeia and its “repression of desire”, see Barber (1992) 10–14.

<sup>234</sup> Basilakes, *progymn.* 26.17–20.

<sup>235</sup> On the erotic symbolism of apples in antiquity and Byzantium, see Littlewood (1974) 34–52.

<sup>236</sup> On the *Reichsapfel* in Byzantine literature, see Littlewood (1974) 48, 55–57. Cf. the apple in the Kassia legend, given to Theodora as a symbol of dominion for the future empress, and also the orb in the ekphrasis of Sophrosyne, *H&H* 2.2.5 and 2.6.3. Cf. also the orbs of the angels in church paintings; Nilsson (1998) 55 and fig. 2 and 3.

<sup>237</sup> Περὶ τοῦ μήλου, Ἔτι ἐγκώμιον τοῦ μήλου, and Καὶ τρίτον εἰς τὸ μήλον ἐγκώμιον, “On the apple”, “Another encomium on the apple”, and “A third encomium on the apple”; pp. 14–30 (text), 61–102 (commentary) in Littlewood (1972).

<sup>238</sup> *H&H* 2.6.3: τὸ περὶ τὴν λαϊὰν σφαιρίδιον, ὡς συνέχει τὸ πᾶν, “while that of the left indicated that the sphere encompassed the universe”.

<sup>239</sup> *H&H* 7.7; cf. *L&K* 2.32.2.



Ἐγὼ δ' εἶχον κλίνην τὴν ναῦν καὶ στρωμνὴν τῆς παρθένου τὰ γόνατα καὶ ὅλος ἀνακλιθεὶς οὕτως ἡδέως ὑπνωττον ὥς οὐδέποτε, νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα· ἡ δέ μοι παρθένος κατεπιθεῖσα τὸ στόμα καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς χεῖλεσιν ἀψοφητὶ κατεφίλει με, καὶ ἦν ἡ ναὺς παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ παστὰς καὶ κλίνη καὶ στρωμνὴ καὶ δωμάτιον. 3 Οὕτως Ἔρως εἰς ψυχὴν ἐμπεσὼν καὶ ὅλην καταδουλώσας αὐτὴν τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πάντων πείθει καταφρονεῖν, ὅλην δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν μεθαρμόζεται. (*H&H* 7.7.2–3)

I had the ship for a couch and the girl's knees as a mattress, and reclining thus I slept sweetly as never before, by Eros. The maiden set her mouth on my eyes and my lips and kissed me silently; and the ship was for us a bridal chamber and couch and mattress and living-quarters. 3 Thus Eros, having forcefully entered the soul and having completely enslaved it, induces it to despise everything else and to completely attach itself to him.

The end of the passage is a *gnome* on the state of a soul in love, illustrating the feelings and actions of both characters. The sentence may be seen as a conclusion to the first part of the story: the falling-in-love period is over, and the couple are now free to love each other and thus to become one, as they already are by means of their names.

The wording here is similar to that in *L&K* 5.16.3, where Kleitophon's and Melite's journey to Ephesos is described.

πᾶς δὲ τόπος τοῖς ἐρώσι θάλαμος· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄβατον τῷ θεῷ. ἐν θαλάσῃ δὲ μὴ καὶ οἰκειότερόν ἐστιν Ἔρωτι καὶ Ἀφροδισίοις μυστηρίοις; θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτης θαλάσσης. 4 χαρισώμεθα τῇ γαμηλίῳ θεῷ, τιμήσωμεν αὐτῆς γάμψ τὴν μητέρα. (*L&K* 5.16.3–4)

For lovers every location is a bedroom. No place is inaccessible to the god. The sea in fact is quite appropriate for Eros and his mother's mysteries—Aphrodite is a daughter of the sea. 4 Let us gratify the goddess of unions and please the sea her mother by our marriage.

Melite tries to seduce Kleitophon, and the implications are clearly sexual. Makrembolites' verbal echo of Tatius may thus imply erotic tones, but it should be remembered that nothing happened aboard the ship: Kleitophon refused, and Melite had to wait until they arrived at Ephesos. In the same manner, nothing happens between Hysmine and Hysminias.

In *H&H* 7.10.5, Aphrodite's bridal bower recurs, now in a negative context: οὕτως ναὺς αὕτη νεκροπομπὸς εἰς Ἅιδου μετάγουσα, οὕτως παστὰς Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Περσεφόνης νυμφών, οὕτως μυθευομένη Σειρήν, "truly this ship is the funerary vessel that conveys us to Hades, truly it is Aphrodite's bridal bower and Persephone's marriage chamber, truly it is the Siren of the myth." In this passage, Aphrodite's bower represents the paradoxical "bride of Hades" motif (for example Sophocles' *Antigone*), and no

longer erotic imagery.<sup>240</sup> The passage should also be compared to Hysminias' dream in *H&H* 6.18, which foreshadows the storm and its dreadful consequences.<sup>241</sup>

The storm strikes already on the first day (*H&H* 7.8); in *L&K* they sail on for three days before the shipwreck (*L&K* 2.32–3.1).<sup>242</sup> The different circumstances make the contrast more striking in *H&H*: the sudden storm diverges sharply from the couple's sweet cuddling in *H&H* 7.7. This is a result of the compressed intrigue in *Makrembolites*: there is no suspense in the episode as in *L&K*, where the long dialogues aboard the ship delay the tragedy.<sup>243</sup> When the storm sets in, Hysmine and Hysminias immediately expect to die, and they tragically lament their fate. Hysmine accuses the omen of Zeus for having deceived them (*H&H* 7.9); Hysminias accuses the dreams for having done the same. Hysmine then blames her mother for taking revenge with the storm (7.11).<sup>244</sup>

In *L&K* the shipwreck is depicted in detail (*L&K* 3.1–5). It is not until 3.5.4 that Kleitophon laments and prays to Poseidon to save them.

εἰ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀποκτεῖναι θέλεις, μὴ διαστήσης ἡμῶν τὴν τελευτήν. ἐν ἡμᾶς κῦμα καλυψάτω. εἰ δὲ καὶ θηρίων ἡμᾶς βορὰν πέπρωται γενέσθαι, εἰς ἡμᾶς ἰχθύς ἀναλωσάτω, μία γαστήρ χωρησάτω, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ἰχθύσι κοινῇ ταφῶμεν. (*L&K* 3.5.4)

If it be your will to destroy us now, spare us at least from isolation in death: let a single wave overwhelm us together. If we are doomed to feed the fish, let a single monster engorge us together, a single stomach accommodate us as one, so that even among the fish we may share a sepulchre.

There is a comic touch achieved by the image of the engorging fish, which has no real parallel in *H&H*, but the theme of the lament—the wish to die together—is similar to that of Hysmine.<sup>245</sup>

σὺν σοὶ θανοῦμαι, τοῦτό μοι παραμύθιον· οὕτω μοι καὶ τὸ ζῆν ποθητὸν καὶ τὸ θανεῖν οὐκ ἀνέραστον. 5 Οὕτω μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου συναπεθνήσκομεν καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πρὸς "Αἶδου μετεβιβάζομεν καὶ παρθένους ἐφυσῶμεν

<sup>240</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 367–375 on “transvaluation”.

<sup>241</sup> See above, pp. 66–68.

<sup>242</sup> *H&H* 7.8–18 was analysed by Cupane and compared to the French *Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors* which, according to Cupane, follows the same narrative scheme as *Makrembolites*' novel; Cupane (1974) 274–281.

<sup>243</sup> *L&K* 2.33–38.

<sup>244</sup> Cf. the evil women and tragedy imagery in *H&H* 5.3.4; see below, pp. 224–227, 283–284.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 59–61 on love and death.



αὐτάς, ἐλευθέρας ἐξ ἀρετῆς καὶ δούλας ἐξ ἔρωτος καὶ δοχεῖα μεστὰ τῶν ἐξ ἔρωτος. (*H&H* 7.11.4–5)

I shall die with you, that is my comfort; just as I found living desirable, so death is not unpleasing. 5 Thus we share death before death and we convey our souls to Hades, we breathe out our virgin souls, free through their virtue but enslaved by love, vessels full of passion.

When the two passages are put next to each other like this, the parodic tone in *L&K* contrasts with the serious emphasis on chastity in *H&H*. But as we will see, the episode in *H&H* is not without humour and parody.<sup>246</sup> In *Tatius*, the prayer of Kleitophon calms the sea, and the couple are saved; in *H&H* it takes more to allay Poseidon's wrath. The narrator reports no details of the ship during the storm, but instead the captain intervenes.

‘Ὁ δὲ γε κυβερνήτης φησὶν ἄνδρες συμπλωτῆρες, ἄνδρες συγκλυδωνιζώμενοι καὶ συναποθνήσκοντες, τὸ πνεῦμα θρασὺ καὶ τὸ κῦμα πυκνὸν καὶ μέχρι νεφῶν ἀννυσόμενον· τὸ ἰστίον διέρρηκται, τὸ σκάφος ὑδάτων μεστόν, ἐμοὶ δ’ οὐκέτι σθένος ἀντέχειν πρὸς τοσοῦτον ὄγκου θαλάσσης καὶ βιαιότητα κλύδωνος καὶ πνευμάτων ἀντίπνοιαν. 2 “Ἄλλις μοι τῶν ναυμαχημάτων ὅλος καθ’ ἡμῶν Ποσειδῶν. Τί μὴ κατὰ τὸν νηίτην νόμον (καὶ κλήρος ὁ νόμος) χοᾶς ἱκετηρίους σπενδόμεθα καὶ τὸ θῦμα κληρούμεθα;’ (*H&H* 7.12.1–2)

The helmsman said, ‘Fellow crewmen, men who share in the tempest and imminent death, the gale is fierce, the waves are incessant and reaching up to the clouds. The sail is in shreds, the hull is full of sea water, no longer do I have the strength to withstand such a weight of water, such a violent gale and such contrary winds. 2 I have had enough of sea-fights. Poseidon is utterly opposed to us. Why do we not follow nautical custom (which is to draw lots) and pour out supplicatory libations and draw lots for a sacrificial victim?’

The lot falls on Hysmine, and the captain becomes an improvised priest:

καὶ καινὸν πῦρ καὶ ἱερεὺς καὶ βωμὸς αὐτοσχέδιοι· ἡ θάλασσα πῦρ καὶ τὸ κῦμα βωμὸς καὶ ἱερεὺς ὁ καλὸς κυβερνήτης, ὁ τὸν νηίτην νόμον τιμῶν, θῦμα δ’ (ἀλλὰ μὴ μοι, καρδία, ῥαγῆς) Ὑσμίνη παρθένος. (*H&H* 7.12.3–4)

So here was a fresh fire and an impromptu priest and altar; the sea was the fire, the waves the altar, and the priest the good helmsman who respected nautical custom, the victim (be not shattered, my heart) the maiden Hysmine.

Kratisthenes tries to save Hysmine, but is almost thrown into the sea himself (*H&H* 7.13.1). Hysminias then attempts to hold on to her, and the captain speaks again:

<sup>246</sup> Parody is here used in its traditional sense; cf. Genette (1997) esp. 26 and 28, who argues that hypertextuality always implies parody, but “serious parody”.

‘Ὁ δὲ γε κυβερνήτης ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις φιλοσοφῶν συμφοραῖς ἀπεφοίβαζε ‘καὶ Χρυσηῖς ἀπεσπάτο χειρῶν Ἀγαμέμνονος βασιλέως· ἀλλὰ μῆνις Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμαλάσσετο, καὶ λοιμοῦ στρατὸς ἀπηλλάσσεται· τοίνυν καὶ ταύτην ἡμεῖς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ θεῷ καταθύσωμεν καὶ ὅλην τοῖς κύμασι καταδύσωμεν καὶ ψυχὰς ἡμετέρας ἀπὸ κλύδωνος σώσωμεν.’ (H&H 7.13.2)

The helmsman, making sage comments on others’ misfortunes, pronounced, ‘As Chryseis was torn from the hands of king Agamemnon, but the wrath of Apollo was assuaged and the expedition was released from plague, so now let us sacrifice this girl to our god and sink her completely beneath the waves and let us save our souls from the storm.’

Hysminias still holds on to the girl, and the captain speaks once more:

ἀλλ’ ὁ πάντα σοφὸς κυβερνήτης καὶ πάλιν κατεφιλοσόφει, καὶ πάλιν κατερρητόρευε ‘Ποσειδῶν’ λέγων ‘τὴν κόρην ζητεῖ· ἐπὶ ταύτην ὁ κλῆρος· αὕτη θῦμα καὶ λύτρον τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν· ἀποσπασθήτω τῶν τούτου χειρῶν, διαρραγῆτω τῶν ὠλέων, παραδοθήτω τῷ βυθῷ καὶ τοῖς κύμασι.’ (H&H 7.14.3)

The all-wise helmsman made another pronouncement and another oration, saying, ‘Poseidon requires the girl; the lot has fallen on her; she is the offering and the atonement for our souls; seize her from that youth’s hands, tear her from his arms, let her be given to the deep and the waves.’

The crew then wrenches her out of Hysminias’ arms, undresses her and delivers her naked to the captain.

ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα σοφὸς καὶ κυβερνήτης καὶ ἱερεὺς καὶ θύτης καινὸς τὴν κόρην λαβὼν καὶ ὅλους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῖς κύμασιν ἐμβαλὼν καὶ 2 ‘τοῦτό σοι θῦμα, δέσποτα Ποσειδῶν, καὶ λύτρον’ εἰπὼν (ἀλλὰ μὴ μοι τὸ τῶν ὀδόντων ἔρκος ἐκφύγῃς, ψυχῇ) τῆς νεὸς τὴν κόρην ἐξεσφενδύνησε καὶ ὅλην ἀφῆκε τοῖς κύμασιν (H&H 7.15.2)

He, the all-wise, helmsman and priest and unaccustomed sacrificer, took the girl and, turning all eyes to the waves, 2 said, ‘This, lord Poseidon, is your offering and atonement’ (may you not, o soul, escape the barrier of my teeth!). He hurled the girl from the ship and let her go completely into the waves.

There is a Homeric tone in the episode. Hysminias refers to himself, perhaps ironically, as *πολύτλας* (“much-enduring”), the traditional epithet of Odysseus.<sup>247</sup> The captain refers to the myth of Chryseis and Agamemnon as a parallel situation.<sup>248</sup> Hysminias uses a Homeric image with his “may you not, o soul, escape the barrier of my teeth!”<sup>249</sup> Other ancient material

<sup>247</sup> H&H 7.12.4. The epithet is used ironically also in Sophocles, *Aias* 956.

<sup>248</sup> H&H 7.13.2; *Il.* 1. Cf. Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 61.

<sup>249</sup> H&H 7.15.2; *Il.* 9.409. Cf. also *Il.* 4.350 and *Od.* 1.64 (similar formula). See also above, pp. 153 and 187.



has also been inserted: quotations from and allusions to Hesiod, Euripides, Herodotus, and some proverbial material. These intertextual devices bring a dramatic and tragic appeal to the text.<sup>250</sup> The method used here is significant: when the Byzantines wanted to express the total catastrophe of a situation and thus emphasise drama, they used a proverbial phrase: 'Ιλιάς κακῶν, "Iliad of woes".<sup>251</sup> The expression is here, through the insertion of Homeric and tragic material, woven into the intertextual web.<sup>252</sup>

The Homeric speeches of the "captain priest" cause a comic and ironic effect, which is enhanced by Hysminias' repeated qualifications of this man "who respects nautical custom" as "good", "wise", and "learned".<sup>253</sup> We may compare the construction of the captain's portrayal to that of the priest of Apollo in *L&K*. The priest expresses himself in a comic tone, and he is described as "an emulator of Aristophanic comedy".<sup>254</sup> In *H&H*, a similar effect is achieved by means of irony.<sup>255</sup>

The contrast to the bloody and spectacular sacrifice of Leukippe (*L&K* 3.15) is striking. There is no cutting, no real violence; the nautical "anarchy" drags Hysmine from Hysminias' arms, that is all. There is, on the other hand, a certain similarity to Leukippe's second death, when she is beheaded and thrown into the sea (*L&K* 5.7), but again, there is no cutting or violence in *H&H*. Burlesque material of that kind has been left out,<sup>256</sup> and it is clear that Hysmine's virginity never is at stake. Even though Hysmine is never

<sup>250</sup> The same structure and function can be seen in other passages, e.g. in the Panthia sequence that will be discussed below, pp. 224–227, 283–286.

<sup>251</sup> See the *Suda*, I 314: ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων κακῶν; see also *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, vol. 1, p. 96 (Zenobius IV.43). Photios uses the expression in letter 13; p. 65 in Laourdas & Westerink (1983). In an ancient text, see Plutarch, *Coniugalia praecepta* 141a.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 79 on "Homerisms"; see also below, pp. 264–265.

<sup>253</sup> *H&H* 7.12.4, 7.14.1, 7.14.3, 7.15.1. On the Homeric and comic tone, see Alexiou (1977) 32 and n. 17; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 61. Cf. also Alexiou, *ibid.* 37–38 on the use of classical allusion and stylistic exaggeration as a part of linguistic expression and also with a deliberately parodic effect.

<sup>254</sup> *L&K* 8.9.1: μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Ἀριστοφάνους ἐζηλωκῶς κωμωδίαν.

<sup>255</sup> The sacrifice episode, along with the speeches of the priest of Apollo in *H&H* 10.14–15 (discussed above, pp. 163–164) should be compared to the lengthy legal proceedings in *L&K* 7.7–9; 7.11–12; 8.8–11. There are no comparable courtroom scenes in *H&H*, but the behaviour and the speeches of the captain and, in particular, the priest of Apollo may be seen as condensed versions of the forensic orations in *L&K*.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 229–235 on "excision"; cf. above, p. 199, n. 161 and p. 200, n. 170.

threatened by external rapists, we should, however, note the erotic tones of her mysterious salvation, and also the “erotic” night aboard the ship.<sup>257</sup>

The sacrifice of Hysmine calms the sea (*H&H* 7.16), as did Kleitophon’s prayer (*L&K* 3.5.4); the episodes thus end in similar ways. But Makrembolites’ episode on Hysmine’s sacrifice is a combination of the traditional storm and shipwreck scenes and of the apparent death of the heroine, and some material has been drawn from other parts of *L&K*. The passage, however different, is thus also a variant of the *Scheintod* motif. This is implied by Hysmine herself in her letter to Hysminias: διὰ σὲ θανάτου γευσάμενη πικροῦ, “because of you I tasted bitter death” (*H&H* 9.9.3).<sup>258</sup> The phrase is echoed by Hysminias himself a little later.<sup>259</sup> The apparent death motif is not necessarily a proof that love conquers death (the reader cannot be sure of that until the end of the novel), but is more likely to signify the extreme “reality” in which love forces the protagonists to exist.<sup>260</sup> Love and death are not necessarily opposed, but may also be linked together; this is a motif with a long tradition.<sup>261</sup> This problematic opposition and equation become part of the novel’s thematics through the insertion of the *Scheintod* motif.

#### THE CHASTITY TEST

In the two novels’ closing books, the heroines’ chastity is tested in varying ways, so as to make sure to the characters as well as to the readers that it

<sup>257</sup> On the saving by the dolphin, see below, pp. 233–234; on the night aboard the ship, see above, p. 214.

<sup>258</sup> Cf. *L&K* 5.18.4: διὰ σὲ ἱερείου γέγονα καὶ καθαρμὸς καὶ τέθνηκα ἤδη δεύτερον, “for your sake I have been a sacrificial victim, an expiatory offering, and twice have died.” The *Scheintod* motif appears in all ancient novels, with the exception of Longus’ *D&C*; also in Iamblichos’ *Babyloniaka*, see Photios’ *Bibl. cod.* 94. The victims are always the heroines; the heroes may be thought dead, but their corpses are never seen; Billault (1991) 203–204. On the motif in the ancient novel and its relation to New Comedy, see Bowie (1996) 100–101; from a mystical point of view, Beck (1984) 147. In *R&D* Rhodanthe suffers apparent death in book 6, but there is no suspense.

<sup>259</sup> *H&H* 9.22.3: ἂ πάντα χαίρω παθών, ὅτι σὲ τὴν ἐμὴν Ὑσμίνην Ἔρως μοι πάλιν ἐξ Ἅιδου καινῶς ἀνέσώσατο, “all this I suffer willingly, because Eros has miraculously rescued my Hysmine for me once more from Hades.” On this passage, see Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 61.

<sup>260</sup> Billault (1991) 204.

<sup>261</sup> Love and death are linked together in epigrams in the *Anthology*, e.g. 5.236, but cf. 5.85 on love belonging to life as opposed to death and also 5.241 on parting as dying; see also Agapitos & Smith (1992) 38. Cf. Eugenianos’ *D&C* 2.169–185, 2.245–246, 6.589, 6.592; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 60 and n. 45.



has remained intact.<sup>262</sup> There is a difference already at the outset: Leukippe has indeed gone through a number of threats to her virginity, but Hysmine has never been harassed by any man.<sup>263</sup> Furthermore, she has already been tested once, when the pirates arrived with her at Artykomis:

Ἀποβάντες οὖν τῆς τριήρους οἱ πειραταὶ καὶ τοῖς πολίταις σπείσάμενοι  
ἐξάγουσι τὸν φόρτον τοῦ σκάφους, καὶ με συνεξάγουσι καὶ περὶ τινα μετάγου-  
σί με πηγὴν καὶ δάφνης με στεφανώσαντες ἐπιρρίπτουσι τοῖς ὕδασι. (*H&H*  
11.16.1)

So the pirates disembarked from the trireme and entered into an agreement with the citizens; they unloaded the cargo from the vessel and took me out too; they brought me to a spring into which they threw me, after putting a garland of laurel on me.

Even though Hysmine does not seem to have been aware at the time of this being a chastity test, Hysminias and the reader must have recognised it as such. The need of the test thus differs in the two novels, and the repeated test of Hysmine should be seen as underlining the emphasis on virginity and Sophrosyne in *H&H*.<sup>264</sup>

Leukippe, after all the complicated trials by the end of Tatius' novel, has agreed to undergo "the ordeal of the syrx". The myth of Pan and Syrx has been told by the priest of Apollo, who has explained that Pan placed the pan-pipes in a grotto now used to test virgins: if the girl who enters the cave is indeed a virgin, you hear a delicate melody and the door springs open; if she is not, you hear a scream and the girl disappears (*L&K* 8.6).<sup>265</sup> Needless to say, Leukippe passes the test (8.13–14). The widow Melite also goes through an ordeal to show that she has been faithful to her husband Thersander while he was away. The very wording "while he was away" saves her, since she in fact slept with Kleitophon *after* Thersander's return, and she passes "the ordeal of the Styx".

While Leukippe's ordeal has little in common with Hysmine's, we may instead compare Hysmine's test to that of Melite. "The ordeal of the Styx" has the following history: a young girl, a huntress by the name Rhodopis, swore to Artemis always to stay a virgin, but she was overheard by Aphro-

<sup>262</sup> Cf. *Aith.* 10.8, where both hero and heroine have to pass the test, and the ordeal by fire in *R&D* 1.372–404, repeated in book 8. Chastity ordeals occur only in the novels of Heliodoros and Tatius; Billault (1991) 215–217. On the motif in the ancient novel, see Rattenbury (1926) with ancient predecessors in pp. 64–66.

<sup>263</sup> Cf. Eugenianos' *D&C*, where both hero and heroine are subjected to unwelcome attention in books 3–4.

<sup>264</sup> Cf. above, pp. 131–132. On virginity in *H&H*, see Garland (1990) 74–75.

<sup>265</sup> Cf. the story of Pan and Syrx in Longus' *D&C* 2.34 (not as a test of virginity). Pan is not mentioned in *H&H*.

dite, who decided to take revenge. A young hunter called Euthynikos was likewise uninterested in erotic mysteries. Aphrodite sent her son Eros on a chase for Rhodopis and Euthynikos and they were hit by his arrows. They took refuge in a cave where they broke their chastity vows. When Artemis found out, hearing Aphrodite laughing, she turned the girl into a spring. When the spring is now used to refute alleged liars, an oath is written on a tablet and hung around the person's neck: if he or she is a liar, water rises and carries off the tablet (*L&K* 8.12).<sup>266</sup>

Hysmine's virginity is to be tested by "the spring and bow of Artemis" in Artykomis. The place and procedure have already been described by Hysminias in book 8, when it was used for his female fellow prisoners (*H&H* 8.7).<sup>267</sup> The spring is considered by the locals to have qualities similar to those of the Rhine or, possibly, to contain the waters of the Rhine.<sup>268</sup> In any case, it holds the power to refute pretended virginity. The spring is situated in the middle of the sanctuary of Artemis, by the feet of a golden statue of the goddess holding a bow. The virgin is thrown into the well with a wreath of laurel on her head: if she is innocent the water stays clear; if "the breath of Aphrodite has put out her virginal torch and Eros secretly has stolen her virginity" the statue stretches her bow and aims at the alleged maiden's head. As the frightened girl tries to hide below the surface, the wreath is carried away by the water. To Hysminias' relief, also Hysmine passes the test (*H&H* 11.17). As mentioned above, he should know that Hysmine already passed the test, but his worry is probably part of the *topos* and may be compared to Kleitophon's reaction: *ὅτι μὲν παρθένος εἶ, Λευκίππη, πεπίστευκα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πᾶνα, ὃ φιλάτῃ, φοβοῦμαι*, "I have utter faith in your virginity, Leukippe, but Pan, my dear, throws me into panic" (*L&K* 8.13.2), and after she has passed, *ἐγὼ δὲ ὅστις ἐγγέρονει οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμι λόγῳ*, "there is no way I could put in words my feelings at that moment" (8.14.2).

There are three parallels between the two stories: the use of famous rivers, Styx and Rhine respectively; the effect of the rising, agitated water; the presence of the virgin goddess Artemis (juxtaposed and opposed to Aphrodite). Instead of adapting Leukippe's ordeal for Hysmine, Makrembolites has apparently drawn material from that of Melite. One may wonder if this was a conscious choice of the author. The contrasts are indeed so

<sup>266</sup> According to Chew (2000) 64, this chastity test is a sign of Tatius' parody of ideal novel morality.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. *Aith.* 10.7–8, where the protagonists are tested along with the other prisoners.

<sup>268</sup> *H&H* 8.7.1: *πηγὴν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, ἣν Ἀρτύκωμις φέρει Ῥήνον ποταμὸν Κελτικόν*; on this passage, see above, p. 140 and n. 344. Cf. also *L&K* 1.18.1–2 on Arethusa.



extreme—the lusty married woman as opposed to the chaste virgin—that one may suspect an ironic subversion in which the contrast is the main point.<sup>269</sup> Another possibility is that the ordeal which included a river had a specific appeal to the Byzantine novelist, since it invited a new design of the traditional motif by the insertion of the river Rhine.<sup>270</sup>

Let us now proceed to some of the motifs that are expressed in passages that have a literary and linguistic counterpart in *L&K*. First we will compare the bad omen of the eagle, the couple being caught *in flagrante*, and the flirting at dinners in the two novels. Then we will study three erotic motifs or myths that were introduced by Tatius and adapted by Makrembolites: Apollo and Daphne, the dolphin as Eros' companion, and the myth of the palm.

#### THE EAGLE

In book 2 of *L&K* a bad omen occurs, causing a delay of the planned marriage between Kleitophon and Kalligone: when Kleitophon's father has placed his sacrifice for the young couple's marriage on the altar, an eagle comes flying and snatches it away.

ἐπειδὴ θυσάμενος ὁ πατήρ ἔτυχε καὶ τὰ θύματα ἐπέκειτο τοῖς βωμοῖς, αἰετὸς ἄνωθεν καταπτὰς ἀρπάζει τὸ ἱερεῖον· σοβούντων δὲ πλέον οὐδὲν ἦν· ὁ γὰρ ὄρνις ὥχετο φέρων τὴν ἄγρην. ἐδόκει τοίνυν οὐκ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι· καὶ δὴ ἐπέσχον ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν τοὺς γάμους. καλεσάμενος δὲ μάντις ὁ πατήρ καὶ τερατοσκοποῦς τὸν οἰωνὸν διηγείται. 3 οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν δεῖν καλλιερῆσαι Ξενίῳ Διὶ νυκτὸς μεσοῦσης ἐπὶ θάλατταν ἥκοντας· ὁ γὰρ ὄρνις ἔτυχεν ἱπτάμενος ἐκεῖ [...] ἐγὼ δὲ ταῦτα ὡς ἐγένετο τὸν αἰετὸν ὑπερεπήμουν καὶ δικαίως ἔλεγον ἀπάντων ὀρνίθων εἶναι βασιλέα. οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν δὲ ἀπέβη τοῦ τέρατος τὸ ἔργον. (*L&K* 2.12.2–3)

This is what happened: when my father had sacrificed the animal, and the meat lay on the altar, an eagle swooped down and snatched it up. It was no good trying to shoo it away, the bird was gone with his catch. They decided this was a bad sign, so they put off the wedding for that day, while my father called in priests and interpreters and told them about the ominous incident. They said that since the bird had flown towards the sea, he must go to the seashore at midnight and there offer sacrifice to Zeus as God of Hospitality [Zeus Xenios]. When this happened I praised the eagle extravagantly—truly the king of all birds. The fulfilment of this marvellous sign was not far off.

<sup>269</sup> In that case, it may be compared to the reversed situation described below in 2.2.7, where we discuss how the characters in *H&H* have exchanged features and functions in comparison to the characters in *L&K*.

<sup>270</sup> On the refuting characteristics of the Rhine, see Plepelits (1989) 189–190, n. 103.

The event foreshadows the kidnapping of Kalligone, but also the elopement of the couple.<sup>271</sup> The same thing happens in Makrembolites' novel, but there it takes place at the sacrifice for Hysmine's wedding with a suitable young man that her parents have chosen. Hysminias happens to witness the event, since he has sneaked out of the house to go to the temple of Zeus Xenios, where his own and Hysmine's parents are gathered for the nocturnal ceremony. After a prayer to the god they put the sacrifice on the fire, and then μέγας δ' αἰετός ἐκ νεφῶν ἀνακλάγξας καὶ μετὰ ροίζου καταχ-υθείς ἤρπασέ τε τὸ θῦμα καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὸν βωμὸν συνετάραξεν, "a huge eagle came shrieking from the clouds and swooped down with swishing wings and seized the sacrifice and scattered those by the altar" (*H&H* 6.10.2).

Whereas Kleitophon's father sends for an interpreter of the event, the characters in *H&H* immediately react to the omen, particularly Hysmine's mother Panthia, who falls to the ground loudly lamenting her daughter's fate: to die (*H&H* 6.10.3–6). This is of course a misinterpretation; the event foreshadows, as in the model, the coming elopement of the couple, already planned. Panthia's reaction causes people at the temple to discuss the meaning of the omen (6.11.3). At home, a discussion takes place as to what the omen means (6.13–6.15). In the Byzantine version, there is no obvious interpretation; the omen needs to be analysed and discussed, whereas in the ancient novel there is one straight answer. This divergence from the model may be considered in relation to the twelfth-century interest in Aristotelian interpretations of dreams and oracles; it seems that the Hellenistic manuals on interpretation no longer were a way to understand a sign.<sup>272</sup>

A brief look at the vocabulary shows that Makrembolites has not reused any linguistic material: only three words match, and none of them is striking: αἰετός (eagle); ἀρπάζω (to seize); βωμός (altar). It is clear that Makrembolites uses different levels of augmentation. On a linguistic level, there is thus little imitation of the hypotext here; the only words that are reused are those required by the context.<sup>273</sup> Instead, amplification is employed on other levels. As we can see, in Makrembolites' version the sacrifice does indeed take place at night by the altar of Zeus Xenios, just as the interpreters in *L&K* recommended. In fact, all the three sacrifices in *H&H* take place at night (*H&H* 5.15; 6.10; 7.1), all of them at the temple of Zeus Xenios. Makrembolites has brought one detail from *L&K* and extended its use in his

<sup>271</sup> Bartsch (1989) 86–87.

<sup>272</sup> Cf. above, p. 110.

<sup>273</sup> Cf. Genette (1997) 78–79 on imitation of words.



own novel. In the following example, we will see how amplification is used in the adaptation of both linguistic and thematic material.

#### THE MOTHER

Shortly after the snatching of the sacrifice, Kleitophon convinces Leukippe to receive him in her bedroom one night. Because of a most unfortunate dream, the couple end up caught *in flagrante* by Leukippe's mother Pantheia.

[...] ἄρτι δέ μου προσελθόντος εἴσω τοῦ θαλάμου τῆς παιδός, γίνεται τι τοιοῦτον περὶ τὴν τῆς κόρης μητέρα· ἔτυχεν ὄνειρος αὐτὴν ταραξάς. 5 ἐδόκει τινὰ ληστὴν μάχαιραν ἔχοντα γυμνὴν ἄγειν ἀρπασάμενον αὐτῆς τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ καταθέμενον ὑπτίαν, μέσσην ἀνατεμεῖν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τὴν γαστέρα, κάτωθεν ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς. παραχθεῖσα οὖν ὑπὸ δείματος, ὥς εἶχεν ἀναπηδᾷ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς θυγατρὸς θάλαμον τρέχει (ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἦν), ἄρτι μου κατακλιθέντος. 6 ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ τὸν ψόφον ἀκούσας ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν, εὐθὺς ἀνεπήδησα· ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην παρῆν. συνεῖς οὖν τὸ κακὸν ἐξάλλομαι καὶ διὰ τῶν θυρῶν ἵεμαι δρόμῳ, καὶ ὁ Σάτυρος ὑποδέχεται τρέμοντα καὶ τεταραγμένον. εἴτα ἐφεύγομεν διὰ τοῦ σκότους καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ δωμάτιον ἐαυτῶν ἤλθομεν. (L&K 2.23.4–6)

Just as I was entering the girl's bedroom, something was happening across the hall to her mother. 5 She was being disturbed by a dream, in which she saw a bandit with a naked sword seize her daughter, drag her away, throw her down on her back, and slice her in two all the way up from her stomach, making his first insertion at her modest spot. Pantheia was so distressed and frightened that she leaped up just as she was and ran the few steps to her daughter's bedroom, just as I was lying down. 6 I heard the noise of the door opening; I sprang to my feet. She was already near the bed. Realizing that the situation was desperate, I jumped aside and hurled myself through the door, running. I collided with Satyros, who held me still trembling and shaken. We ran through the dark until we reached our room.

The following passage describes the reaction of the mother. She is of course greatly disturbed, she hits the chambermaid Kleio and then bursts into a flow of accusations and anger:

‘Ἀπώλεσάς μου,’ λέγουσα, ‘Λευκίππη, τὰς ἐλπίδας. 2 οἱμοί, Σώστρατε· σὺ μὲν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ πολεμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἀλλοτρίων γάμων, ἐν Τύρῳ δὲ καταπεπολέμησαι καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τις τοὺς γάμους σεσύληκεν. οἱμοί δειλαία, τοιοῦτους σοι γάμους ὄψεσθαι οὐ προσεδόκουν. 3 ὄφελον ἔμεινας ἐν Βυζαντίῳ· ὄφελον ἔπαθες πολέμου νόμῳ τὴν ὕβριν· ὄφελόν σε κἂν Θορὰς νικήσας ὕβρισεν· οὐκ εἶχεν ἡ συμφορὰ διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην ὄνειδος. νῦν δὲ, κακόδαιμον, ἀδοξεῖς ἐν οἷς δυστυχεῖς. 4 ἐπλάνα δέ με καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐνυπνίων φαντάσματα, τὸν δὲ ἀληθέστερον ὄνειρον οὐκ ἐθεασάμην. νῦν ἀθλιώτερον ἀνεμῆθης τὴν γαστέρα· αὕτη δυστυχεστέρα τῆς μαχαίρας τομῆς· οὐδὲ εἶδον τὸν ὑβρίζοντά σε,

οὐδὲ οἶδά μου τῆς συμφορᾶς τὴν τύχην. οἷμοι τῶν κακῶν· μὴ καὶ δοῦλος ᾦν;<sup>7</sup>  
(L&K 2.24.1–4)

‘You’ve ruined all I ever hoped for, Leukippe. 2 O Sostratos! While you’re fighting for other men’s marriages in Byzantium, you have been defeated in Tyre, and someone has despoiled your own daughter of *her* marriage. You pitiful thing: I had hoped for something better in the way of a wedding. 3 Why did you ever leave Byzantium? Better you were a wartime atrocity, better raped by a victorious Thracian soldier than this. That would have been a disaster but not a disgrace, if force was used. Wretched girl! This way you lose your reputation along with your happiness. 4 My dream misled me: the truth was worse than I saw. That incision in your stomach is much more serious: he pricked you deeper than a sword could have. But I didn’t see the man who did it; I don’t know how the disaster happened. Oh, dear me! What if it was a *slave*!’

Pantheia does not believe Leukippe’s assurance that her virginity is intact, and Kleitophon and Satyros decide that the only solution is to run away with Leukippe.<sup>274</sup>

Makrembolites has placed the whole incident *within* a dream. Hysminias has finally fallen in love with Hysmine, and he experiences a whole series of erotic dreams. In the last dream he is in the garden embracing Hysmine, but when he tries to “do something more erotic” the embrace turns into a struggle, since the girl is not completely willing. The mother now appears and the following happens:

Ἐν μέσοις τούτοις ἡ τῆς κόρης μήτηρ ἐφίσταται, καὶ τοῦ πλοκάμου λαβομένη τὴν κόρην ὡς ἐκ λείας ἐφέλκεται λάφυρον, λοιδοροῦσα τῇ γλῶσσῃ καὶ πλήτουςα τῇ χειρί· ἐγὼ δ’ ὥσπερ κατακεραυνωθείς ὅλος ἤμην ἐμβρόντητος. 4 Ἄλλ’ ὁ πάντων ὀνείρων ἀγριώτατος ὄνειρος οὔτε μ’ ἀφήκεν ἀναισθητεῖν καὶ τὴν τῆς Πανθίας γλῶσσαν εἰς Τυρσηνικὴν μετεχάλκευσε σάλπιγγα κατατραγωδοῦσαν τὰ κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ καταλοιδοροῦσάν μοι τὸ κηρύκειον· βαβαὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, τῆς ὑποκρίσεως· λέγουσαν· Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί· 5 ὁ κήρυξ, ὁ παρθένος, ὁ τῆς δάφνης ἐστεφανωμένος, ὁ τὰ Διάσια φέρων εἰς Αὐλικώμιδα, ὁ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἴσα καὶ θεῶ φιλοτίμως φιλοφρονούμενος, μοιχός, ἀκόλαστος, βιαστής, δεύτερος Πάρις εἰς Αὐλικώμιδα κατασυλᾷ μου τὸν θησαυρόν, ἀνορύττει μου τὸ κειμήλιον. 6 Ἄλλ’ ἔχω σε τὸν ληστήν, τὸν τοιχωρύχον, τὸν ἀλιτήριον, τὸν ἀποσυλῶντα τὰ κάλλιστα. Μητέρες ὅσαι παρθενικούς θησαυροὺς κατορύττεσθε καὶ περὶ τὴν φυλακὴν ἀγρυπνεῖτε τῶν θησαυρῶν, ἰδοὺ τὸν ἐπίβουλον ἔχω τῷ τῆς δάφνης στεφάνῳ κατακρυπτόμενον, τῷ σεμνῷ χιτῶνι, τῷ ἱερῷ πεδίλῳ καὶ τῷ κηρύγματι, ὅλην ἐνδεδυμένον τὴν λεοντήν, ὅλην ὑποπλαττόμενον τὴν σκηνήν. 7 Οἷς ὁ γλυκὺς ἀντιπνεύσας τῆς σωφροσύνης ζέφυρος ἐλέγχει τὸν δόλον, ἀπογυμνοῖ τὸ κρυπτόμενον· καὶ νῦν οὐκέτι κήρυξ ὁ κήρυξ, ἀλλ’ ἄρπαξ, ἀλλὰ ληστής, ἀλλὰ τύραννος. 8 Λάινον τῷ τυράννῳ

<sup>274</sup> This dream may be compared to Kleitophon’s dream of Kalligone in L&K 1.3.4; on this passage, see Bartsch (1989) 85–87; on L&K 2.23, see *ibid.* 87–89.



τὸν χιτῶνα, γυναῖκες, ἐξυφανόμεθα· καταζωγραφήσωμεν τὴν σκηνήν, τὴν ὑπόκρισιν τεχνουργήσωμεν καὶ στηλιτεύσωμεν τῷ χιτῶνι τὸν τύραννον, ἃν ἢ τοῦτο γυναιξὶ κόσμος, παρθένοις τείχος, καὶ στέφανος Ἀυλικώμιδος.

Τί δ'; Οὐ γυναῖκες εἶλον Αἰγύπτου τέκνα

καὶ Λήμνου ἄρδην ἄρσένων ἐξέκισαν;

Πολυμνήστωρ δ' οὐκ ἐκ γυναικῶν ἐξεκόπη τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς·'

4 Ταῦτ' εἶπε καὶ στρατὸν καθώπλισε γυναικῶν καὶ παντελῶς κατεβάκχευσε καὶ κατ' ἐμῆς κεφαλῆς ἐξεστράτευσεν' (H&H 5.3.3–4.1)

While all this was going on, the girl's mother arrived and, grasping the girl by the hair, dragged her off like loot from war-spoils, yelling vituperations and slapping her. I was absolutely thunderstruck, as though I had been blasted by lightning, 4 but that most aggressive of dreams did not let me remain senseless and turned Panthia's tongue into a Tyrrhenian trumpet<sup>275</sup> which brayed out against me and cursed my herald's wand. 'Alas for your theatricals', she said, 'and your play-acting. Zeus and the gods! 5 The herald, the chaste youth who was crowned with laurel, who brought the Diasia to Aulikomis, who was welcomed amongst us and cherished like a god—he is a fornicator, a libertine, a rapist, a second Paris who has come to Aulikomis where he ravages my treasure, robs me of my heirloom. 6 But I've got you now, you thief, you robber, sinner and despoiler of what is most beautiful! All you mothers who conceal your virgin treasures and keep sleepless watch over your treasures, look, I have the traitor who was masked by the laurel crown, the august tunic, the sacred sandal and his office—he put them all on like a lion skin,<sup>276</sup> he invented the whole play. 7 But the sweet zephyr of Sophrosyne blew against these and convicted him of deceit and revealed what had been hidden. So the herald is no longer a herald but a robber, a brigand, a tyrant. 8 Women, let us weave a tunic of stone for the tyrant;<sup>277</sup> let us paint his scenery for him, let us perfect the performance and let us publicly emblazon the tyrant with his tunic so that our actions will be an ornament for women, a bulwark for virgins and a crown for Aulikomis! *Did not women destroy the children of Aegyptus and empty all Lemnos of males?*<sup>278</sup> Were not Polymnestor's eyes gouged out by women?'<sup>279</sup>

4 She said this and instigated an army of women to action and succumbed entirely to a Bacchic frenzy and launched a campaign against my head.

At this Hysminias calls out to Kratisthenes who wakes him up.

The dream allows the narrator to dwell on the dramatic aspect of the situation. To Hysminias Panthia is a true horror; she does not care much about Hysmine, just drags her away from the hero by her hair and slaps her, before concentrating all her wrath on Hysminias. Pantheia, on the other hand,

<sup>275</sup> Cf. e.g. Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 567–568 and Sophocles, *Aias* 17; see below, p. 268, n. 41.

<sup>276</sup> Allusion to Heracles' abduction of Iole.

<sup>277</sup> For the expression "weave a chiton of stone", i.e. to lapidate, see *Il.* 3.57.

<sup>278</sup> Euripides, *Hecuba* 886–887.

<sup>279</sup> The blinding of Polymnestor is narrated in the *Hecuba* 981–1046.

who could not attack Kleitophon, since she did not know who the perpetrator was, abused her daughter in very harsh words, but she did not hit her; it was Kleio that she hit and dragged by her hair.

If we look at the wording of the two passages, the laments of Pantheia are expressed in terms of robbery and war.<sup>280</sup> Makrembolites has picked up the robber-theme, and amplified it so as to cover the whole speech of Pantheia. The word *ληστής* is used only once in *L&K*; Makrembolites employs both the same word and others within the same range of meaning: Pantheia drags the girl from Hysminias as loot from war-spoils (*ὡς ἐκ λείας λάφυρου*), she calls him a fornicator, a rapist, a robber, a thief, and so on. There is thus in this passage amplification on verbal and stylistic levels, a device that includes the use of the almost identical names Pantheia and Panthia. There is also a conspicuous tragic flavour to the passage, which will be discussed in further detail below.<sup>281</sup>

#### THE FLIRTING

The flirting of the protagonists is an important motif in both Tatius and Makrembolites, and it is closely tied to the dinner motif.<sup>282</sup> Two episodes in *H&H* recall passages in *L&K*. Firstly, the placing of the couple at dinner is stressed in both novels. In Tatius, it happens at the first dinner the couple attend together:

καὶ ἐπεὶ καιρὸς ἦν, συνεπίνομεν κατὰ δύο τὰς κλίνας διαλαχόντες (οὕτω γὰρ ἔταξεν ὁ πατήρ), αὐτὸς καὶ γὰρ τὴν μέσσην, αἱ μητέρες αἱ δύο τὴν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τὴν δεξιᾷ ἐῖχον αἱ παρθένου. 2 ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ταύτην ἤκουσα τὴν εὐταξίαν, μικροῦ προσελθὼν τὸν πατέρα κατεφίλησα, ὅτι μου κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνέκλινε τὴν παρθένον. 3 τί μὲν οὖν ἔφαγον, μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς, ἔγωγε οὐκ ᾔδειν· ἔφκειν γὰρ τοῖς ἐν ὀνείροις ἐσθίουσιν. ἐρείσας δὲ κατὰ τῆς στρωμνῆς τὸν ἀγκῶνα καὶ ἐγκλίνας ἐμαυτὸν ὅλοις ἔβλεπον τὴν κόρην τοῖς προσώποις κλέπτων ἅμα τὴν θέαν· τοῦτο γάρ μου ἦν τὸ δεῖπνον. (*L&K* 1.5.1–2)

When the dinner hour came, we took our places at table as my father arranged us, two on a couch—he and I on the middle couch, the two mothers on the left, the two maidens on the right. When I heard him announce this arrangement [ἐν-

<sup>280</sup> On the use of laments as a rhetorical device in the ancient novel, see Birchall (1996); note esp. pp. 2–7 on the lament's place among, and relation to, *progymnasmata*.

<sup>281</sup> See below, pp. 283–284.

<sup>282</sup> On the dinner motif in *H&H*, see Rey (1996); on the function of dinners in Prodomos, but also the sophistic novels, Makrembolites and Eugenianos, see Harder (1997a). According to Harder, *ibid* 141 and n. 22, the dinners in *H&H* illustrate the geographical, social and psychological stations that the protagonists go through. In Prodomos, the dinners (there are five of them) structure the plot (along with sleep, night and day, *ibid* p. 134, n. 5) besides having a political function.



ταξίαν], I almost went over and kissed him for displaying her thus before my eyes. As to what we had for dinner, by all that's holy, I really don't know: I ate like a man in a dream. With one elbow resting on the pillow and putting myself at an angle for a better view, I watched her directly, though without ever seeming to stare. She was my entire meal.

In Makrembolites, the corresponding episode does not take place until the two families have arrived in Eurykomis, Hysminias' hometown.<sup>283</sup> In Aulikomis, Hysmine was serving the wine, and she used that as an occasion for flirting with Hysminias. Now he himself has fallen in love and is much more inclined to flirting.

Ἐκ μὲν οὖν [τοῦ] τῆς περὶ τὸν κήπον [μέρους] τῆς τραπέζης πλευρᾶς πατὴρ ἐμὸς Θεμιστεύς καὶ μήτηρ Διάγρεια καὶ τρίτος ἐγώ, ὅλον ἀποθέμενος τὸ κηρύκειον· ἐκ δὲ θατέρου Σωσθένους πατὴρ Ὑσμίνης, Πανθία μήτηρ· 4 καὶ μετὰ δὴ τὴν μητέρα τὴν Ὑσμίνην ἡ τάξις ἐκάλεσεν· ἐγὼ γοῦν καθ' αὐτὸν τὴν τάξιν ἐπῆνεσα καὶ ταύτης ἐμαυτὸν ἐμακάρισα, τὸ πρᾶγμα κρίνων οἰωνὸν αἰσιώτατον, καὶ αὐτῆς, ὃ φασι, γραμμῆς εὐτυχεῖν ἐδόκουν τὸν ἔρωτα. (*H&H* 5.9.3–4)

On the side of the table that was by the garden was my father Themisteus and my mother Dianteia and the third was myself, having completely laid aside my herald's wand. On the other side was Hysmine's father Sosthenes and her mother Panthia; 4 next to her mother strict rank [τάξις] placed Hysmine.<sup>284</sup> I inwardly praised the etiquette and thought myself most blessed in this, considering the matter most propitious, and I thought that I would, as they say, from the very outset get lucky in love.

Hysminias does not dwell on his feelings about this situation; he has in fact already experienced the same feelings as Kleitophon in a dream he had before leaving Aulikomis (*H&H* 3.5). In the dream a dinner description was intertwined with Hysmine's flirting, which for the first time was returned by Hysminias.<sup>285</sup> Now that Hysmine is no longer serving the wine, Makrembolites instead takes the opportunity to proceed directly to some "erotic playing". The passage is long and complex; we will look only at one part of it as an example. Kratisthenes, who is now in charge of the wine, gives the same cup alternately to Hysmine and Hysminias.

<sup>283</sup> For the same motif in other Komnenian novels, see also *R&D* 2.120–128, 2.145–149; *D&C* 9.207–211.

<sup>284</sup> This is how I interpret the passage: if the hosts are placed "on the side of the table that was by the garden", then the guests are placed on the other side of the table so that they may watch the garden. We may note that the dinner guests in *H&H* are sitting at the table (the Byzantine way), otherwise Hysmine could not possibly press Hysminias' foot with her own while serving the wine; cf. also *H&H* 1.6.2 and 4.1.1.

<sup>285</sup> On the repetitive scheme of these scenes, see above, pp. 70–76.

Μετὰ γοῦν τὴν Πανθίαν καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν μητέρα Διάντειαν ἦκε φέρων ἐπ' ἐμὲ Κρατισθένης τὸ ἔκπωμα· τούτῳ γὰρ ὁ πατήρ οἰνοχοεῖν ἐγκελεύεται· ἐγὼ δὲ λαβὼν μικρὸν ἐξερρόφησα· εἶθ' ὥς ἐκ μεταμέλου πρὸς τὸν δόντ' ἀντιδίδωκα, καταλοιδορήσας αὐτῷ τῆς ἀταξίας καὶ τῆς τῆς εὐταξίας συγχύσεως· ἡ γὰρ τάξις τῇ κατὰ μέτωπόν μου παρθένῳ τὸ προπιεῖν ἐχαρίσατο. 4 Ὁ δὲ πεισθεὶς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκόμισε τὸ ποτήριον· ἡ δ' ὅλαις χερσὶν ὑπεδέξατο, κἄν ὡς παρθένος ἄκροις δακτύλοις ἐδέξατο· καὶ τὸν νοῦν ὅλον καταλαβοῦσα τοῦ δράματος εὐχαριστεῖ μοι τῷ σχήματι, μικρὸν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐρωτικῶς ὑποκλίνασα, οἷον κυπάριττος ἀνεμουμένη μικρὸν ἐξ εὐκραοῦς ζεφύρου λεπτου· καὶ ἦν τὸ σχῆμα χαρίτων μεστὸν καὶ εἰδωλον Ἔρωτος. 5 Οὕτως ἐκοινοῦμεθα τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ ἦμεν ὅλοι συμπίνοντες καὶ λίαν ἐρωτικῶς καταπίνοντες· οὕτω τὰ χεῖλη παραδόξως ἀνακεκράμεθα, ὅλον ἐρώτων ἐρατὸν ὁπὸν ἀμελγόμενοι καὶ ὅλους ἀλλήλους τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μετέλκοντες ἐπὶ τὰς ψυχάς. (H&H 5.10.3–5)

After Panthia and my mother Dianteia, Kratisthenes came up to me, carrying the cup—my father had put him in charge of the wine—and I took it and sipped a little but then, as if changing my mind, I handed it back to him, chiding him for his lack of etiquette and for having broken the order of precedence; for strict decorum demanded that the maiden opposite me should drink first. 4 He obeyed and took the cup to her; she grasped it with both hands, even though—as befits a maiden—she took it with her fingertips only.<sup>286</sup> Understanding the point of this by-play, she thanked me with a gesture, inclining her head slightly in erotic manner, like a cypress gently swaying in a light breeze; and the gesture was full of grace and she was like a reflection of Eros. 5 So we shared the cup, and imbibed together and drank very passionately; thus we mingled our lips in no ordinary manner, sucking the passionate juices of our love and each drawing the other into our souls with our eyes.

The “kisses” are then repeated twice, each time slightly different; it is now Hysmine who is given the cup first and invents different reasons for giving it back (H&H 5.11–12). The passage is filled with rhetorical figures and word-plays, the central pun being the double meaning of *χείλη* (lips/brim):

Ὁ δ' ἀλλὰ (τί γὰρ ἄλλο ποιεῖν ἔμελλε;) παρτίθετο, καὶ νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα τὴν παρθένον ἐδόκουν πίνειν αὐτήν· τὰ χεῖλη ταύτης κατεφίλου ἐρωτικῶς καὶ φιλῶν ὑπέκλεπτον τὰ φιλήματα· ὑπηρετήν εἶχον τὸ ἔκπωμα τῆς ἐμῆς φίλης Ὑσμίνης τὰ χεῖλη μετακομίζον μοι. (H&H 5.11.4)

So—what else could he do—he offered it and, by Eros, I seemed to be drinking down the girl herself. I kissed her lips passionately and, as I kissed, I stole kisses. For the cup was my assistant who conveyed my beloved Hysmine's lips to me.

<sup>286</sup> The phrase *ὅλαις χερσὶν ὑπεδέξατο* suggests Hysmine's inner feeling of acceptance and desire—she accepted the cup “wholehandedly”, i.e. wholeheartedly—and then comes the clarification that she still held it, like any well-brought-up girl, lightly with her fingers and did not grab it.



In *H&H* 5.12 the cup is instead described as a mirror that brings the girl herself into Hysminias' soul, which may be compared to several of the philosophical and metaphysical expressions of love used in *L&K*.<sup>287</sup> After dinner, when Dianteia has kissed the girl goodnight, Hysminias takes the chance of having yet another kiss, kissing his mother and thus, again, the girl.

τὰ χεῖλη τῆς μητρὸς κατεφίλησα καταφιλῶν τεχνικῶς τῆς κόρης τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ εἶχον τὴν μητέρα καθυπουργοῦσαν εἰς ἔρωτα καὶ μετακομίζουσάν μοι φιλήματα. (*H&H* 5.13.2)

I kissed my mother's lips and in effect kissed the girl's face, and I enrolled my mother in the service of Eros, conveying her kisses to me.

In *L&K* a similar passage appears in book 2:

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου καιρὸς ἦν, πάλιν ὁμοίως συνεπίνομεν. ὦνοχρεὶ δὲ ὁ Σάτυρος ἡμῖν καὶ τι ποιεῖ πρᾶγμα ἐρωτικόν. ἐναλλάσσει τὰ ἐκπώματα καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν τῇ κόρῃ προτίθησι, τὸ δὲ ἐκείνης ἐμοί, καὶ ἐγγέων ἀμφοτέροις καὶ κερασάμενος ὤρεγεν. 2 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπιτηρήσας τὸ μέρος τοῦ ἐκπώματος, ἔνθα τὸ χεῖλος ἢ κόρη πίνουσα προσέθηκεν, ἐναρμολοσάμενος τὸ ἐμὸν ἔπινον, ἀποστολιμαῖον τοῦτο φίλημα ποιῶν, καὶ ἅμα κατεφίλον τὸ ἐκπῶμα. 3 ἢ δὲ ὡς εἶδεν, συνῆκεν ὅτι τοῦ χείλους αὐτῆς καταφιλῶ καὶ τὴν σκιάν. ἀλλ' ὃ γε Σάτυρος συμφορήσας πάλιν τὰ ἐκπώματα ἐνῆλλαξεν ἡμῖν. τότε ἦδη καὶ τὴν κόρην εἶδον τὰ ἐμὰ μιμουμένην καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πίνουσαν, καὶ ἔχαιρον ἦδη πλέον. καὶ τρίτον ἐγένετο τοῦτο καὶ τέταρτον καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτως ἀλλήλοις προεπίνομεν τὰ φιλήματα. (*L&K* 2.9)

When we came to the wine course, we all drank as usual, but Satyros was in charge of the wine, and he arranged an erotic sleight of hand: exchanging cups, he set mine before the girl and hers in front of me. After pouring the wine and mixing in the water he offered them to us. I took note of the place on the rim where her lips had touched the cup when she drank, and put my lips to the same place. So I kissed the cup itself and left a vicarious kiss for her. She saw me and understood that I was thrilled even by the trace of her lips. But Satyros collected and exchanged our cups again.<sup>288</sup> Then I saw her mimic my action, drinking as I had done, which made me even happier. This happened a third time, and a fourth time, and so we pledged our love, drinking and kissing for the rest of the day.

The two scenes from *L&K*, the dinner arrangement in book 1 and the play with the cups in book 2, have in *H&H* been combined into one long, continuous sequence. The Byzantine couple take a more active part in the play: it is not Kratisthenes who invents the game, he is merely their go-between. It is significant that Makrembolites has picked up the *εὐταξία*, the "good arrangement" that Tatius used when he described the first dinner (*L&K* 1.5.2)

<sup>287</sup> *L&K* 1.4.4; 1.9.4; 4.8.3; 5.13.4. See above, pp. 199–200.

<sup>288</sup> This sentence has been left out in Winkler (1989).

and placed it in the second part of his long passage (*H&H* 5.10.3) and not in the first part, where it may seem more appropriate (5.9.3–4). The ἀποστολιμαῖον φίλημα, the “missive kiss” sent by Kleitophon to Leukippe on the brim of the cup (*L&K* 2.9.2), is in the corresponding passage by Makrembolites described in other words, but instead we find the very same expression in book 9, when Hysmine acts as *mediatrix* between Rhodope and Hysminias, μαστροπὸς ἐγὼ, καὶ ἀποστολιμαῖον τὸ φίλημα, “I am the procuress, and this kiss is her message” (*H&H* 9.16.4). The expression may be compared to that used a little later, ἡ μὲν οὖν Ῥοδόπη τὴν Ὑσμίνην εἶχε μέσον ὄρον<sup>289</sup> πρὸς ἔρωτα καὶ μέσῃ ταύτῃ συνάγειν ἐδόκει τὸν ἔρωτα, “so Rhodope used Hysmine as her middle term in her passion and thought that, through her, her passion would make progress” (9.20.2).

#### APOLLO AND DAPHNE

Finally we will look at three motifs in Tatius, all closely connected with love, that have been adopted by Makrembolites: the myth of Apollo and Daphne, the dolphin as Eros’ companion, and the legend of the male and female palm.

In *L&K*, the story of Apollo and Daphne is told, or actually sung, after the first dinner: a slave plays the lyre and sings.

τὸ δὲ ᾠσμα ἦν Ἀπόλλων μεμφόμενος τὴν Δάφνην φεύγουσαν καὶ διώκων ἅμα καὶ μέλλων καταλαμβάνειν, καὶ γινομένη φυτὸν ἢ κόρη, καὶ Ἀπόλλων τὸ φυτὸν στεφανοῦμενος. τοῦτό μοι μάλλον ἄσθεν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν (*L&K* 1.5.5)

The song was Apollo’s complaint at Daphne’s running away from him, his pursuing and almost capturing, how she was transformed to a tree and he wove her leaves into a wreath for himself. This lyrical interlude fanned higher the fire in my soul.

The song stirs Kleitophon’s love for Leukippe, ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός, “for stories of love stir feelings of lust”, and he says to himself:

“Ἴδού καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἐρᾷ, κακῆϊνος παρθένου, καὶ ἐρῶν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται, ἀλλὰ διώκει τὴν παρθένον· σὺ δὲ ὀκνεῖς καὶ αἰδῇ καὶ ἀκαίρως σωφρονεῖς· μὴ κρείττων εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ;” (*L&K* 1.5.7)

‘Look here, Apollo himself loves a maiden; unashamed of his love, he pursues her—while you hesitate and blush: untimely self-control! Are you better than a god?’

<sup>289</sup> The same expression occurs in Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1142b 24; Plepelits (1989) 191, n. 120. Cf. the interest in Aristotelian scholarship in the 12th century, and the inclusion of Aristotelian interpretations in the novel; see above, pp. 110 and 185.



The myth thus has a didactic function: it is an *exemplum* that makes Kleiophon accept his role as lover/pursuer.<sup>290</sup> In *H&H*, Hysminias tells the myth in book 8, when he describes the feast of Apollo celebrated in Daphnepolis:

Καιρὸς οὖν ἑορτῆς, καὶ λαμπρὰ πανήγυρις Δαφνηπόλει τῇ πόλει, καὶ παρθένου Δάφνης φυγὴ τὰ τῆς ἑορτῆς καὶ φύσις ὁμωνύμου φυτοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Ἀπόλλωνος ἑορτὴ καὶ πανήγυρις· παρθένος γὰρ ἡ Δάφνη καὶ παρθένος καλή. Ταύτης Ἀπόλλων ἔρᾳ, καὶ ἡ παρθένος φρίττει τὴν συμπλοκὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνανεύει τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τὴν Γῆν δυσωπεῖ· ἡ δ' ἐλεεῖ τὴν κόρην καὶ φεύγουσαν κρύπτει καὶ παρθένον τηρεῖ καὶ φυτὸν ὁμώνυμον ἀντιδίδωσιν· Ἀπόλλων τοῦ φυτοῦ στεφανοῦται καὶ παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἔρωτα. Παρὰ γοῦν τῇ δάφνῃ βωμὸς καὶ πόλις ὁμώνυμος· Ἀπόλλωνος ὁ βωμὸς, καὶ ἡ πόλις Δαφνήπολις. (*H&H* 8.18)

It was the time of the festival and there was a brilliant celebration in the city of Daphnepolis, and the subject of the festival was the flight of the maiden Daphne and the nature of the homonymous plant, and it was above all Apollo's festival and celebration; for Daphne was a maiden, and a beautiful one. 2 Apollo loved her but the maiden shuddered at the god's embrace and refused his love and sought help from the Earth; Earth had pity on the girl and concealed her in her flight, she watched over the maiden and transformed her into the plant that bears her name. 3 Apollo made a garland from the plant and consoled himself for his passion. So close by the plant are an altar and a city of the same name; the altar is to Apollo and the city is called Daphnepolis.

The myth of Daphne is a story of both virginity and violence: Apollo pursues Daphne to rape her, but does not succeed.<sup>291</sup> The opposition chastity/sex mirrors central thematics of *H&H*, and it is therefore logical that the myth has been picked up by Makrembolites and inserted into his own novel. The adjective "homonymous", used three times in the passage, both recalls the homonymy of the protagonists, and indicates the city's importance for the couple.<sup>292</sup> Daphnepolis, as a place and also as a concept, with the connotations Daphne, laurel and chastity,<sup>293</sup> should be seen in relation to the emphasis laid on chastity in the novel. Daphnepolis is central also as a mirror of Eurykomis, and the city's tradition brings Hysminias to Artykomis, where he can be reunited with Hysmine. More important, Daphne-

<sup>290</sup> On aggressive, masculine desire contrasted to silent, feminine compliance in the myth of Apollo and Daphne, and also in that of Zeus and Europa, see Konstan (1994) 65–66; Chew (2000) 61–62.

<sup>291</sup> Cf. the myth of Pan and Syrinx in Longus' *D&C* and in *L&K*.

<sup>292</sup> On the names of the protagonists, see above, pp. 156–159.

<sup>293</sup> On the symbolism of the laurel, see above, pp. 114–117.

polis is where the reunion with the parents and the *dénouement* of the plot take place.

Parenthetically, we may note that Kleitophon's reasoning in *L&K* 1.5.7 on self-control and love is picked up by Makrembolites in book 2 of *H&H*, but there in a dialogue between Kratisthenes and Hysminias. Kratisthenes scolds Hysminias, asking how long he will try to escape Eros.

Εἶδες τὸν Ἔρωτα; εἶδες τὸ πῦρ, τὰ τόξα, τὴν γύμνωσιν, τὸ πτερόν; Εἶτα σὺ μόνος ἐλεύθερος ἔρωτος; σὺ μόνος; Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔα με σωφρονεῖν, ὡγαθέ· τοὺς γὰρ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς. (*H&H* 2.14.6)

Have you seen Eros? Have you seen his fire, his bows, his nakedness, his wings? Are you alone free from love—you alone? I said to Kratisthenes, 'Allow me to be chaste, my good friend, for the gods love the chaste and hate evil men.'

As long as Hysminias has Kratisthenes by his side, he has no need of inner reasoning. Kratisthenes is his *alter ego*, who has the same function as Kleitophon's inner voice in *L&K*.<sup>294</sup>

#### THE DOLPHIN

The ambiguity of the myth of Daphne—the tension between virginity and violence—is reflected also in Hysmine's story about how she was saved by a dolphin. The girl is apparently ashamed and nervous about telling her story; she is sweating and stammering.

[...] 'τὰ μὲν δὴ μέχρι νεῶς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ κλύδωνος εἴρηται' φησί 'τῷδε τάνδρι· 2 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐξεσφενδονήθην εἰς θάλασσαν, δελφὶν ἐπὶ νῶτόν με δέχεται, τοῖς κύμασι κυβιστῶν καὶ ὄλος κούφως νηχόμενος· ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεκαθήμην μὲν γυμνὴ τῷ θηρί καὶ τοῖς κύμασιν ἐκκώμην καὶ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἱλιγγίων καὶ πρὸς τὸν τοῦ θηρὸς φόβον τὴν ψυχὴν ἐσπαρattόμην αὐτήν· εἶχον ὡς σωτήρα τὸν θῆρα καὶ τὸν ὑπηρέτην ἐλογιζόμεν ἔχθρόν· ἔφριττον τὸν σωτήρα, τὸν ἔχθρόν ἐφίλουν, καὶ ὡς σωτήρι μὲν συνεπλεκόμεν αὐτῷ· ἐπεὶ δὲ θῆρ ὁ σωτήρ, ἐζήτουν φυγεῖν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐθάρρουν τοῖς κύμασι, καὶ ἤμην κατακλυδωνιζομένη καὶ λογισμοῖς καὶ κύμασι καὶ θηρί.

14 Ἐπεὶ δ' ἤδη τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεφύσων τοῖς κύμασι, μειράκιον ἐφίσταται μοι γυμνὸν (ἐπὶ δελφίνος ἐστὼς καὶ αὐτὸ) καὶ χεῖρά μοι προτείνει καὶ λαβὼν ἐπὶ τὴν χέρσον ἐξάγει με, καὶ πτερυζάμενον τοῖν ποδοῖν (ἦν γὰρ πτερωτὸν τῷ ποδὲ) ἀπέπη μου τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. (*H&H* 11.13.1–14.1)

'This man has told you everything that happened as far as the ship, the sea and the storm. 2 When I was cast into the sea, a dolphin took me on its back as it plunged through the waves and swam on lightly. I, in my nakedness, rode on the wild beast, confused by the waves and made dizzy by the sea, and in my fear of the beast

<sup>294</sup> On Kratisthenes' function, see above, pp. 161–162, and below, pp. 256–258.



my soul was quite torn apart. 3 The creature was my salvation, yet I thought my benefactor was my enemy; I was terrified of my saviour but loved my enemy and I entwined myself around him as though he were my saviour. 4 Since my saviour was a wild beast, I sought to escape from him, but I dared not trust the waves, and I was buffeted by my thoughts and the waves and the creature.

14 When I was on the point of breathing out my soul into the waves, a naked youth appeared before me and also rested on a dolphin; he stretched out his hand to me and, taking hold of me, brought me to dry land; then, fluttering his feet (for both feet were winged), he flew away from my sight.

The episode has no parallel in *L&K*, but the connection between Eros and dolphins is there; dolphins and cupids are dancing around Europa and the bull in the initial ekphrasis.<sup>295</sup> The story of Arion being saved by a dolphin is also mentioned by Sosthenes as a comparison to the rescue of Thersander: εἶτα κατέλεγε τὴν ναυαγίαν ἐκθειάζων ὥς ἐσώθην καὶ τερατευόμενος ὑπὲρ τὸν δελφῖνα τὸν Ἀρίονος, “then he recounted the shipwreck, exaggerating the miraculous rescue as if it were a wonder beyond Arion’s dolphin” (*L&K* 6.13.2).<sup>296</sup> Hysmine’s rescue is indeed a wonder beyond Arion’s dolphin: this is the only time Eros appears outside a dream.

There are certain sexual connotations in the passage. The vocabulary recalls intercourse (*συνεπλεκόμενῳ*), and we may compare it to Hysminias’ descriptions of his erotic dreams about Hysmine.<sup>297</sup> As already mentioned, the passage can also be interpreted in Christian terms—the dolphin as our Saviour—perhaps a convenient explanation in case of censure for impudence.<sup>298</sup> Double meanings like this lead to complex intertextual patterns and ambiguous interpretations. But now the reader knows for sure what has been fairly obvious all along: Hysmine is Eros’ *protégée*—the most beautiful rose in his garden—and *although* a virgin, she is initiated into his mysteries.

<sup>295</sup> *L&K* 1.1.13: περὶ δὲ τὸν βούν ὠρχοῦντο δελφῖνες, ἔπαιζον Ἑρωτες, “around the bull dolphins danced and Loves cavorted.”

<sup>296</sup> The story of Arion and his rescue is described in detail in Plutarch, *Septem sapientium convivium* 160f–163d: how he throws himself into the sea and is surrounded by the dolphins, reasoning about the opportunity to be saved, and noting that the sky and sea are clear. The similarities are not striking, but the closure of the essay is interesting: the symposium is ended by the Homeric words νύξ δ’ ἤδη τελέθει· ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι (*Il.* 8.282 and 293), which is how symposiums are ended in *H&H* 2.13.3 and 4.19.2; see above, pp. 82–83 and 88, and below, p. 272. On dolphins, see also above, p. 144 and nn. 370–371.

<sup>297</sup> *H&H* 3.7. Cf. also the garden descriptions of the trees and plants intertwining; see above, pp. 209–210.

<sup>298</sup> For allegorical interpretations of the novels, see above, pp. 31–32.

## THE PALM

In *L&K*, the legend of the palm is used as an *exemplum*.<sup>299</sup> Satyros, here acting as *praeceptor amoris* (replacing Kleinias), asks Kleitophon about love so that he can impress Leukippe with his stories.<sup>300</sup> Afterwards he notes that the girl is not displeased, and the boys congratulate themselves on good mythology and good timing (*L&K* 1.19). The story runs as follows:

ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου φυτὸν ἔρᾶν, τῷ δὲ φοίνικι τὸν ἔρωτα μάλλον ἐνοχλεῖν. λέγουσι δὲ τὸν μὲν ἄρρενα τῶν φοινίκων, τὸν δὲ θήλυν. 4 ὁ ἄρρην οὖν τοῦ θήλεος ἔρᾳ· κἂν ὁ θήλυς ἀπωκισμένος ἢ τῇ τῆς φυτείας στάσει, ὁ ἔραστῆς ὁ ἄρρην αὐαίνεται. συνίστησιν οὖν ὁ γεωργὸς τὴν λύπην τοῦ φυτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ χωρίου περιωπὴν ἀνελθὼν ἐφορᾷ ποῦ νένευκε· κλίνεται γὰρ εἰς τὸ ἐρώμενον. καὶ μαθὼν θεραπεύει τοῦ φυτοῦ τὴν νόσον· 5 πτόρθον γὰρ τοῦ θήλεος φοίνικος λαβὼν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἄρρενος καρδίαν ἐντίθησι. καὶ ἀνέψυξε μὲν ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ φυτοῦ, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀποθνήσκον πάλιν ἀνεζωπύρρησε καὶ ἐξανέστη, χαῖρον ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς ἐρωμένης συμπλοκῇ. καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ γάμος φυτῶν. (*L&K* 1.17.3–5)

There is such a thing as plant-life passion, and it is particularly pressing in the case of the palm, a species whose members (they say) are distinguished as male or female. The male desires the female: if the female is too far away in the plantation's arrangement, the male lover begins to droop. The farmer understands what the plant is suffering and climbs up to a vantage point to see in which direction the palm is nodding, for it declines in the direction of its desire. When this is discovered, he tends the tree in its sickness by grafting into its heart a shoot of the female palm. And the tree's life revives; its dying body is renewed and stands upright, joyful at the embrace of his beloved. And so may plants be wed.

Makrembolites only hints at the story, but in a highly erotic manner. Hysminias receives a letter from Rhodope, in which she expresses her wish to enjoy Hysminias' love in exchange for Hysmine's freedom, with Hysmine acting as *mediatrix*. Hysminias, after reading the letter, exclaims:

‘ὅσα σοι δοκεῖ πρὸς χάριν Ῥοδόπης εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἐξ ἐμῆς ταῦτα φάθι φωνῆς. Εἰ δὲ καὶ φιλεῖσθαι ζητεῖ, καταφίλησον, καὶ μετάθου φιλήματα, ὅσα τῶν ἐμῶν τούτων χειλέων ἔχεις πολλὰ στόματι παρατεθειμένα τῷ σῶ· εἰ δ' οὐ μόνοις ἀρκεῖται φιλήμασιν οὐδ' ἐν χεῖλεσι παραμυθεῖται τὸν ἔρωτα, κατὰ δὲ τὰς τῶν φοινίκων θηλείας πτόρθον ἐξ ἄρρενος φοίνικος περὶ μέσσην αὐτῆς ζητεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν, καταπράξομαί σοι καὶ τοῦτο τῇ Ῥοδόπῃ διαπεμπόμενος.’ (*H&H* 10.3)

‘Whatever thanks you think should be given to Rhodope, say them as if from me. If she asks to be kissed, kiss her, and give her all the many kisses that my lips have stored on your mouth. 2 And if she is not satisfied with kisses alone and her

<sup>299</sup> On the story in antiquity, see Vilborg (1962) 35. The whole passage (*L&K* 1.17) is imitated by Eugenianos, *D&C* 4.135–148.

<sup>300</sup> Cf. above, p. 198 on digressions as erotic incitement.



passion is not assuaged with lips but, like female palm trees, she seeks a shoot from the male palm to penetrate into her innermost soul, I shall demonstrate with you, conveying this to Rhodope.’

The two situations are very different. In *L&K*, erotic myths are often used as didactic *exempla*, but in *H&H* they never are. Here, Makrembolites picks up just a small detail and mentions it in passing.<sup>301</sup> The remarkable thing here is the overt penetration imagery that is achieved through a revision of the myth: Makrembolites has turned the female shoot into a male shoot. This is indeed a more suggestive image than Tatius’ version, since it contains a direct hint at sexual intercourse.<sup>302</sup> The situation in which Hysminias utters this may explain his outspokenness: he is subjected to sexual advances from both Rhodope and his own mistress, and he has finally met his beloved Hysmine again. Directly after the discussion with Hysmine, he goes to bed and experiences an erotic dream, the first for a long while. He explains the dream in Aristotelian terms: ὥσπερ γὰρ νοῦς πεινῶντος ἄρτον φαντάζεται καὶ ὕδωρ ὄνειροι τῷ διψῶντι, οὕτως ἐρώσῃ ψυχῇ πάντα πρὸς ἔρωτα μεταπλάττεται, καὶ διαλογισμοὶ καὶ τὰ καθ’ ὕπνου φαντάσματα, “for just as a starving man’s mind imagines bread and water fills the thirsty man’s dreams, so for a soul in love everything—thoughts, sleeping visions—is directed towards passion” (*H&H* 10.4.2).<sup>303</sup> Surrounded by women and being “only human” Hysminias seems to have nothing but sex on his mind, which may serve to explain his erotic hint before Hysmine.<sup>304</sup>

Not in any of the cases analysed in this chapter, whether dealing with a *topos* or a specific episode from Tatius, has Makrembolites adopted a motif without making changes: he has recycled and transformed stock conventions, sometimes drawing also from other ancient novels; he has twisted and distorted episodes, sometimes with a humorous or ironic touch; he has reor-

<sup>301</sup> Cf. above, pp. 197–200 on the use of digressions in *L&K* and *H&H*.

<sup>302</sup> Cf. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 3.142–143: ἄρσενα φύλλα πετάσσας, θηλυτέρῳ φοῖνικι πόθον πιστώσατο φοῖνιξ, “male palm stretched his leaves over female palm, pledging his love.” In the *Dionysiaca*, the palm is described in a garden ekphrasis (3.131–179); we may note that the garden contains a number of sculptures (3.169–179). Cf. also the “wet dream” of Hysminias (*H&H* 3.7.6–7) which, even if daring, includes no such suggestions; see above, p. 196.

<sup>303</sup> Dreams of wish-fulfilment are discussed in Aristotle, *Probl.*, 957a, and also in Plato, *Rep.* 9.571c, 574d, 576b; MacAlister (1990) 199–200. Cf. in ancient literature e.g. Penelope’s dream about Odysseus’ return in *Od.* 19.535–581.

<sup>304</sup> It is tempting to see also parodic hints in the passage, with Hysminias playing the male victim: “I’ll do anything for you, love, I’ll even make love to you!” In that case, the victimised hero may be seen as a subversion of the previous emphasis on chastity.

ganised material, combining, amplifying or reducing motifs and episodes; he has redistributed words and phrases. For the reader of *H&H* a knowledge of the hypotext *L&K* adds a significant, if not necessary, dimension to the novel. Makrembolites' contemporary readers, most of them probably his fellow intellectuals and writers, had that knowledge and were most likely more than happy to put it to the test. A contemporary reader knew Tatius as well as Makrembolites did himself, and there is no reason to suspect that he did not recognise the allusions and the changes. We may ask ourselves *why* Makrembolites would bother to write the literary work that he did if there was no audience to enjoy it. Byzantine writers did not write for their own creative pleasure; they created for a specific audience and, most often, for a specific patron.

#### THEMES

In chapter 1.2.4 we discussed the themes of *H&H*, expressed by the motifs of the novel: the problematics of love, the process of maturity and the nature of art. A corresponding discussion on *L&K* is in place here. However, what we consider to be the themes of *L&K* depends upon how we interpret the text. Tatius' novel has been interpreted as a parody or a pastiche of earlier novels, and even as a Platonic essay.<sup>305</sup> If read as a traditional ancient novel, *L&K* displays the themes of love and adventurous Fate, drawing on many generic sources and accordingly displaying a miscellaneous character. But if *L&K* is read as a parody, new themes have replaced the traditional ones, since the same motifs no longer express the same themes.<sup>306</sup> If it is interpreted as a Platonic novel, the love theme should be seen from a metaphysical perspective rather than from a realistic or adventurous one.

We border here upon the subject of "meaning" of literary texts. It is important to remember that a text's meaning should never be seen as definite, since it depends upon the reader's personal and subjective understanding. The relation of Makrembolites' themes to those of Tatius should thus be seen as dependent upon his own understanding of *L&K*. We cannot be sure how Makrembolites understood thematics, but we have seen how his own text implies a number of interpretations of *L&K* through its literary strategies: what he has chosen to imitate or leave out, in what way material has been reworked or subverted etc. The motifs that Makrembolites picked up from *L&K*, some of which we have considered here, express themes that are

<sup>305</sup> See above, p. 170, n. 25, and p. 182, n. 75.

<sup>306</sup> See esp. Chew (2000) who argues that *L&K* is a parody of novel morality, mocking the Sophrosyne of the ideal novels.



all related to different aspects of love: the philosophical, the erotic and burlesque, and the rhetorical and artistic.

I have already discussed above the Platonic and philosophical tone in *L&K* and *H&H*; I believe that Makrembolites recognised the philosophical aspects of Tatius' novel and that he imitated and extended those aspects on different levels in his own work.<sup>307</sup> In doing so he drew from other genres as well, such as the philosophical essay or dialogue, with the result that *H&H* comes out as "more philosophical" than *L&K*, since it contains so much more than just allusions. I have also suggested that Heliodoros and Tatius represented different kinds of models to the Byzantines: *L&K* represented sex and ekphrasis, the *Aithiopika* something more serious and chaste.<sup>308</sup> The burlesque ingredients in *L&K* have been left out by Makrembolites, but the erotic and sexy is extended and brought to the fore. The comic here functions on a different level, by means of irony (not seldom metatextually expressed) and literary puns; action is repressed and there is thus no space for absurd adventures.

In contrast to the love-at-first-sight situation in *L&K*, it is the maturity process that is emphasised in *H&H*. The personal perspective on love as viewed by an inexperienced individual has replaced the metaphysical and "natural" processes described in *L&K*. The "personal" is, however, always expressed in rhetorical terms and thus, in a way, strictly artistically portrayed.<sup>309</sup> Art and rhetoric, an important element in many Second Sophistic literary works and thus in *L&K*, have been augmented in *H&H*, bringing in Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe* as a secondary hypotext. The rhetorical plays—narrative as painting, painting as narrative—underline the aesthetic principles of *H&H*: the novel concerns the *nature* of art and not just the skills of describing. For example, *L&K* contains a number of vivid and visualising ekphraseis, but in *H&H* there are active discussions on both the meaning of the paintings and their artistic aspects in relation to narrative (the painter/the rhetor). In the pictorial representations, which are described through rhetorical art, love is described from different perspectives and eventually equated with art itself: love is art and art is love.

---

<sup>307</sup> See above, pp. 181–186.

<sup>308</sup> See above, p. 36.

<sup>309</sup> See above, pp. 90–91, 165.

## 2.2.5 Time and space

We have returned a few times in this study to the lack of action in *H&H* in comparison to *L&K*. This needs to be considered in relation to the two authors' treatment of temporal and spatial aspects.

The action in *L&K* spans less than one year, and there is a break of six months in book 5. The temporal structure is firm, often with an organisation of pairs of days and nights.<sup>310</sup> Temporal specifications are frequent: shorter breaks in time of "a few", three, or ten days and even different times of the day.<sup>311</sup> Time is emphasised also in authorial comments on the nature and effect of time.<sup>312</sup> For example, when the break of six months occurs the narrator comments upon it with a well-known saying: καὶ ἤδη μοι γεγόνεσαν μῆνες ἕξ, καὶ τὸ πολὺ τοῦ πένθους ἤρχετο μαραίνεισθαι· χρόνος γὰρ λύπης φάρμακον καὶ πεπαίνει τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἔλκη, "six months had now passed, and the vivid impressions of sorrow were just beginning to fade; for time cures grief and soothes the heart's wounds" (*L&K* 5.8.2).

Even if it seems to take a longer time for Hysmine and Hysminias to fall in love and be ready to elope (*H&H* books 1–6) than it does for Leukippe and Kleitophon (*L&K* books 1–2), this is a false impression. In *L&K*, about twenty days probably pass before the elopement;<sup>313</sup> in *H&H* only six days. About the same number of days are, however, covered by the narrative (7 days in *L&K*; 6 days in *H&H*), but the days described by Tatius are interspersed with the elliptical time markers "after x number of days..." mentioned above. Tatius' days are also extremely action-packed; on the second day, for example, Kleitophon discusses love with Kleinias (*L&K* 1.7–11), Kleinias' boyfriend is killed and buried (1.12–14), Kleitophon discourses on love in the garden (1.15–19), Leukippe plays the lyre (2.1), and they have dinner in the evening (2.2–3). During the corresponding period in *H&H*, Hysminias and Kratisthenes look at the paintings in the day and have dinner in the evening. The descriptions of events and action that are inserted into the main story line of *L&K* are replaced in *H&H* by the extremely detailed descriptions of the paintings and the reactions of the spectators.

<sup>310</sup> Hägg (1971a) 68–73; 73–76 on phases ignoring the day-and-night frame.

<sup>311</sup> "A few days" pass e.g. in *L&K* 2.11.1 (ὀλίγων δὲ ἡμέρων διελθουσῶν) and 2.19.1 (ὀλίγας δὲ ἡμέρας διαλιπῶν). For temporal expressions used in *L&K*, see Hägg (1971a) 64–66; see also pp. 76–82 on the time scheme.

<sup>312</sup> Hägg (1971a) 302.

<sup>313</sup> There are in all three breaks of ten (*L&K* 2.3.3) or "a few" days (2.11.1, 2.19.1), and 7 days are covered by narrative. Provided that "a few days" indicate at least three days, about 20 days should have passed since Leukippe arrived at Tyre.



As we saw above in chapter 1.2.5, time in *H&H* is carefully measured and controlled. The action extends across one year and some days, and there is a break of about one year in book 8. Temporal specifications are frequent—how many days passed, or at what time of the day something happened, often related to eating or sleeping—and these specifications are used as markers in organising the episodes. In *H&H*, there is only one occasion on which the number of days is not specified.<sup>314</sup> Tatius' pairing of days has in *H&H* been replaced by groups of three days and/or nights. The authorial commentary in *L&K*, the digressions on the nature and effect of time, have in Makrembolites a counterpart in the ekphrasis on the twelve months: this is Makrembolites' comment on time in his novel. The painting has an inscription: τοὺς ἀνδρας ἀθρῶν τὸν χρόνον βλέπεις ὅλον, "when you contemplate these men, you see the whole year" (*H&H* 4.17.2). The twelve months may be seen as a symbol of the year during which the protagonists will be separated, but the emphasis is most likely on the other aspect of the word *χρόνος*, namely "your whole life".<sup>315</sup> The painting in that perspective alludes to and represents the maturity theme of the novel. Time as a requirement for the development of love is recommended by Kleinias,<sup>316</sup> and is accordingly hinted at already in Tatius; Makrembolites has made it part of his thematics.

#### FICTIONAL SPACE

The setting of *L&K* is the eastern Mediterranean, where the protagonists travel and experience their adventures.<sup>317</sup> Kleitophon lives in Tyre, which is where the couple meet, while Leukippe comes from Byzantium. From Tyre they travel to Egypt and later to Ephesus, where they are reunited. In the end they sail to Byzantium to get married, and then back to Tyre. The narrative act takes place in Sidon, where the initial narrator (the fictional au-

<sup>314</sup> Hysmine does not know for how long she stayed at the shore after being saved by Eros: μετὰ γοῦν δὴ τινὰς ἡμέρας, ὧν ἀκριβῶς οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἀριθμόν, "after several days—I cannot tell precisely how many" (*H&H* 11.14.2).

<sup>315</sup> The warrior of March representing youth, the frail man of February old age. See Stern (1955) 84; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 84–85. Cf. also the discussion of Eros and where he belongs in *H&H* 4.20: where in the year or where in life?

<sup>316</sup> *L&K* 1.9.6 μέγιστον γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐφόδιον εἰς πειθῶ συνεχῆς πρὸς ἐρωμένην ὁμιλία. ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ πρόξενος καὶ τὸ σύνθημα τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς χάριν ἀνυσιμώτερον, "the quickest way to win a girl's heart is persistent exposure: eyes are the ambassadors of love, and the habit of daily sharing encourages reciprocity." Cf. *M&P*, column 2, 60–62: "love rather is a stirring of the mind aroused by beauty and increasing with familiarity"; for the quotation in Greek, see above, p. 205, n. 191.

<sup>317</sup> For convenient maps, see Alvarez (1996): A (the world of the novels) and D (*L&K*).

thor) chances upon Kleitophon. The reader is, however, never told how Kleitophon ended up in Sidon;<sup>318</sup> Sidon is not even mentioned in the story. The geographical movement of *L&K* is thus circular and closed: the couple return to the place where it all started.

Hysmine and Hysminias are the first novelistic characters who live in a completely fictional world; the cities are called Eurykomis, Aulikomis, Artykomis and Daphnepolis. Makrembolites has thus not imitated Tatius' geographical locations, despite his reuse of names and motifs.<sup>319</sup> Hysmine and Hysminias move in their fictional environment just as their predecessors did in the Mediterranean, and on the surface it does not seem to differ much in its vaguely ancient–Hellenistic features: there are the same religious festivals, the same gods and pirates, and Athens is known and referred to. But Makrembolites' fictional space seems to be deliberately vague, and the difference is thus striking from the sometimes graphic visualisation in *L&K*, for example in the topographic ekphrasis of Alexandria.<sup>320</sup> A curious detail is that Syria is apparently situated by the same sea as the fictional cities, since it is by ship that the protagonists plan to elope. Their own world thus seems to exist parallel with, or bordering upon, that of the ancient novel. Makrembolites' fictional names may in that respect refer to any cities in the Greco-Roman world used by the ancient novelists and not particularly to those in *L&K*.<sup>321</sup>

Since internal movement is not dependent on any geographical facts, it can sustain the spatiotemporal structure of the novel: even if we do not know the supposed locations of Makrembolites' cities, the movement is circular in the sense that the protagonists return to their initial meeting place. In comparison to *L&K*, we should note that Hysmine and Hysminias return to exactly the same spot: they marry in the garden of Sosthenes where they first laid eyes on each other. This precise circularity, along with the careful description of Sosthenes' garden, emphasises the centrality of Aulikomis as opposed to the vagueness of the surrounding world.<sup>322</sup> The construction of fictional space is accordingly a significant part of the almost geometrical compositional style of Makrembolites.

<sup>318</sup> For a discussion of that issue, see Most (1989).

<sup>319</sup> On names drawn from *L&K*, see above, pp. 155–156; on motifs, see above, 2.2.4.

<sup>320</sup> *L&K* 5.1.

<sup>321</sup> On the names of the cities in *H&H*, see above, p. 140. One may note that *L&K* is the only ancient novel where the protagonists' movements are restricted to the eastern Mediterranean; considering the care that Makrembolites devoted to details, the mentioning of Syria as the only geographic indication may be a hint at the model.

<sup>322</sup> Cf. Meunier (1998) and Beaton (2000).



## EVENTFUL VS. UNEVENTFUL; TEMPORAL VS. SPATIAL?

As we have seen, time plays an important role in both *L&K* and *H&H*, in Tatius mainly as a structural device, in Makrembolites also developed into the theme of maturity: time as part of love's progress. Tatius' novel cannot, however, be described as entirely temporally structured, but rather as using a spatialising device different from that of Makrembolites. In *L&K*, the chronological order has been manipulated to create space for parallel action, using anticipations and recapitulations as means of delay. The difference, then, between the ancient model and the Komnenian transformation, is that the former employs devices related to the plot, while the latter concentrates on the textual structure. This may also be seen in relation to the alleged lack of action in *H&H*: while Tatius digresses on action, Makrembolites inserts ekphraseis of paintings and pathetic monologues. Action has accordingly been placed on an emotional and artificial level, which counterbalances the uneventful content, draws the attention from the plot and puts the emphasis on love and art.<sup>323</sup>

There is a plausible reason why Makrembolites did not need to elaborate the novelistic plot in the same manner as did Tatius: the pattern of events was supposed to be already familiar to the audience.<sup>324</sup> As discussed earlier, we may assume that Makrembolites' probably rather small circle of colleagues had the same knowledge of the ancient novels as he himself did. Makrembolites could instead concentrate on a downright and stylised elaboration of details, the text being significant in itself and not made so by dramatic episodes. One may note here that the novel of Tatius was related to those of Xenophon of Ephesos and Chariton and to the pre-sophistic novel in a similar way: if Tatius' audience had not been familiar with the previous novels, he could not have used the conventions for his own comic distortions since they would have had no effect.<sup>325</sup>

<sup>323</sup> Cf. above, p. 238. See Alexiou (1977) 40–41 on eroticism and psychology replacing traditional action; on psychology, see also Hunger (1968) 74.

<sup>324</sup> Cf. Smith (1999) 177–182 on the *Achilleid* and the presupposed knowledge of its audience.

<sup>325</sup> A related discussion is that of the audience of the pre-sophistic, the sophistic, and the Komnenian novels. There seems to have been a gradual increase of exclusiveness as the metatextual aspects of the genre became more and more complex; the novel in the 12th century moves even further away from the alleged "popularity" of the ancient genre. Should we perhaps assume that the later readers were more interested in all the different forms of transtextuality than in "action"? Considering the strong emphasis on imitation, transformation, and subversion in the 12th century, this is not inconceivable. In the vernacular romances, the trend seems to have turned in another direction: it is a knowledge of episodes and action that is presupposed, not of literary tradition; cf. Smith (1999) 177–182.

## 2.2.6 Point of view

As we have seen and discussed earlier, *L&K* opens with the initial narrator/fictional author arriving at Sidon, where he is approached by a young man who tells him his story of love.<sup>326</sup> The young man is Kleitophon, the hero-narrator of the novel. From this point on, the story is narrated in the first person, which is a break with the previous novelistic tradition. Xenophon of Ephesos and Chariton both employed the omnipresent, panoramic technique belonging to the epic tradition.<sup>327</sup>

Technically, *L&K* is not the simple narrative in the first person that it may seem at first sight. It is a *reported* ego-narrative: the story is told in the first person by Kleitophon to the fictional author, who in his turn recounts it to the reader.<sup>328</sup> The story is thus initially in *double* ego-narrative, because we must remember that it is the fictional author who describes the city of Sidon, its painting of Europa and the meeting with Kleitophon. Only initially, though, because the narrative frame is never closed at the end of the novel, and we never return to the painting in Sidon.<sup>329</sup> In the second part of the novel, the strict first-person perspective of the first part is abandoned for a more panoramic view of the action, in which the distinction between first- and third-person narrative is partly eliminated.<sup>330</sup> There are, for example, signs of an omniscient author-narrator who offers the reader anticipating hints.<sup>331</sup> The first-person perspective of Kleitophon does not exclude omniscience, because the story *is* concluded, and is then reported *as* concluded to someone else. We are not dealing with an evolving first-person perspective in action; there is a difference between “the narrating Kleito-

<sup>326</sup> On the opening of *L&K*, see above, pp. 178–180.

<sup>327</sup> Fusillo (1991) 177. On point of view in Chariton, Xenophon Ephesios and Tatius, see Hägg (1971a) 112–137. On point of view in *L&K* see also Fusillo (1991) 166–178; Reardon (1994); Lowe (2000) 246–249.

<sup>328</sup> We may note that in *L&K* we can make the modern distinction between the *homodiegetic* ego-narrator who himself participates in the action—Kleitophon—and the *heterodiegetic* who does not—the fictional author, Kleitophon’s interlocutor in the opening scene; Fusillo (1991) 166, but note also p. 167: “il n’y a pas d’opposition absolue entre les deux formes.” See also Reardon (1994) n. 4. As a comparison, in *H&H* Hysminias is the homodiegetic narrator, whereas there is no heterodiegetic narrator.

<sup>329</sup> Fusillo (1991) 168; Reardon (1994) n. 4. On the discussion of the unclosed frame, see above, pp. 189–191.

<sup>330</sup> Hägg (1983) 42–43. See also Hägg (1971a) 131–132; Fusillo (1991) 170. Cf. Anderson (1997) 2283.

<sup>331</sup> For example *L&K* 5.2.3: οὐκ ἐψέκει δὲ ἄρα ὁ θεὸς ἐπιτεύειν ταῖς ἡμετέραις εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ’ ἔμενεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλο τῆς Τύχης γυμνάσιον, “but the god, I suppose, did not listen to our prayers, and further trials were in store for us on Fortune’s obstacle course.”



phon" and "the experiencing Kleitophon". There are also more distinct breaks with the first-person perspective than anticipating remarks, above all in the main recapitulations in which the adventures of the couple are recounted. Kleitophon then tells the experiences of Leukippe (*L&K* 8.5.4–6), without the reader knowing how he knows. These cases are still rather small variations of perspective, and one may be inclined to agree with Anderson in his critical question "how often, when a writer allows a character to tell a story, is the reader actually asking himself how the character knows a particular piece of information?"<sup>332</sup> But a careful reader does ask himself, and an inconsistent first-person narrator spoils the impression of "natural" restriction and honesty.<sup>333</sup>

One may ask oneself why Tatius abandoned, even if not entirely, the omniscient authorial method of earlier novels, and replaced it with first-person narration. One of the main effects of ego-narrative is to induce credibility, to authorise the story by means of an eye-witness, someone who was actually there.<sup>334</sup> This is, of course, an important device of historiography and paradoxography.<sup>335</sup> Another significant function is that of the reader's identification with the narrator: in first-person narration it is easier for the reader to put himself in the place of the author or story-teller.<sup>336</sup> First-person narration also allows the author to give the reader only the information he wants; he can either let the reader learn the whole story, or deliberately suppress some of it; he can let the reader feel in charge, or hold him in suspense.<sup>337</sup> A similar effect may be achieved also in a third-person narrative, but a first-person narrator can cause an illusory "natural" restriction of perspective. Tatius has explored the possibility to choose, and varies between the two.<sup>338</sup> According to Reardon, the ego-narrative contributes largely to Tatius' distortion of standard novelistic elements.<sup>339</sup> It is further used to create suspense in regard to the unexpected and burlesque turns of the plot, and to pursue psychological realism.<sup>340</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup> Anderson (1997) 2282–2284.

<sup>333</sup> Unless the desired effect is to mirror a confused or upset state of mind, which is not the case here.

<sup>334</sup> Fusillo (1991) 167, 178; Reardon (1994) 89; cf. Most (1989).

<sup>335</sup> This is, for example, one of the devices that are parodied in Lucian's *A True Story* (*Vera Historia*).

<sup>336</sup> Hägg (1971a) 113.

<sup>337</sup> Fusillo (1991) 177; Reardon (1994) 82.

<sup>338</sup> Hägg (1971a) 129–134, 137; Reardon (1994) 82–86; Fusillo (1991) 168–176.

<sup>339</sup> Reardon (1994) 86–91. On Tatius' distortion of standard novel elements, see above, pp. 172–173.

<sup>340</sup> Reardon (1994) 88–89.

## RESTRICTION OF VIEWPOINT AND PSYCHOLOGY

Makrembolites used first-person narration in *H&H*, but he did not adopt Tatius' varied level of viewpoint. Instead he extended the restricted viewpoint of the first part of *L&K*: *H&H* is told consistently from the point of view of the experiencing narrator Hysminias. Hysminias never reports things that he has not himself heard or seen.<sup>341</sup> Also, Makrembolites does not use restricted viewpoint in the same way or with the same function. Let us consider two similar passages in the two novels: *L&K* 5.7.4, where Leukippe is apparently beheaded and thrown into the sea, and *H&H* 7.15, where Hysmine is cast into the sea as a sacrifice.

In the ancient novel, Tatius exploits the restricted point of view in having Kleitophon be too far away to see what actually happens; it is in fact an unknown woman dressed in Leukippe's clothes who is being decapitated. Kleitophon does not find out the truth until more than six months later, when he is reunited with the living Leukippe.<sup>342</sup> The restriction of perspective here creates tension and suspense. In *H&H*, the situation is different: Hysminias watches Hysmine being thrown overboard, but he does not see that she is saved by a dolphin; as far as we can tell from his own account, he does not even try to see what happens to her. Suspense is instead upheld throughout the whole novel through the overall restricted viewpoint of Hysminias: until Hysmine's own account of the dolphin is presented by herself in book 11, the experiencing Hysminias does not know about it.<sup>343</sup> The reader is thus not deceived in the same manner as he is by the passage in *L&K*, and there is no burlesque appeal. Comic effect is achieved in *H&H* by literary or rhetorical devices, most often by insertions of ancient quotations or shifts from one level of style to another. As we have already seen above, these are exactly the devices used in this passage.<sup>344</sup> Makrembolites prefers to thwart the reader ironically and metatextually instead of bringing in burlesque action.

<sup>341</sup> Alexiou (1977) 30–31. The only possible, but not likely, deviation from the restricted viewpoint is *H&H* 7.12.3: ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπὶ τὸν κλῆρον, κακῶ τὸ κακὸν θεραπεύοντες, "and we were in favour of casting lots, mending a bad situation with a worse." This does not necessarily hint at a knowledge of what will happen, i.e. that Hysmine will become the sacrifice, but the example highlights the difficulties involved in the analysis of viewpoint, and the fine line that divides different levels of first-person narration.

<sup>342</sup> On the restriction of viewpoint in *L&K*, see Fusillo (1991) 171–178.

<sup>343</sup> See further below, p. 246. Hysmine's rescue is, however, hinted at in Hysminias' dream in *H&H* 7.19, on which see above, p. 68.

<sup>344</sup> See above, pp. 216–218.



The other aspect of Tatius' use of first-person viewpoint, the psychological interest and "realism", appears also in *H&H*.<sup>345</sup> The effect is extended by means of Makrembolites' careful restriction of action and focus on inner feelings. While Tatius shifts his emphasis from inner to outer action in book 3, Makrembolites continues to concentrate on feelings and displays the surrounding action merely as a background for the continued emotional development. The impression of personal, emotional experience is enhanced by the sense of direct narrative, constructed by exclamations and commentary.<sup>346</sup> There is a great contrast to the way in which Kleitophon relates his adventures as carefully planned and selective stories without much, if any, emotional involvement.<sup>347</sup>

#### WHAT HAPPENED TO THE HEROINES?

In both novels the importance of the heroines' parts of the story is underlined. In *L&K* it is the hero-narrator himself that encourages Leukippe to speak:

οὐκ ἔρεῖς ἡμῖν τὸν μῦθον τῶν τῆς Φάρου ληστῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποτμηθείσης ἐκεῖ τὸ αἶνιγμα κεφαλῆς, ἵνα σου καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀκούσῃ; τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος. (*L&K* 8.15.3)

Tell us the tale of the cutthroats at Pharos and the riddle of the severed head. Your father should hear this too. This is the only scene missing from the whole drama.

We have already considered the corresponding passage in *H&H*, where the priest of Apollo requests Hysmine to tell her story: "would you now like to fill out the crescent so that the whole story becomes fully illuminated for me?"<sup>348</sup> There are two significant differences in the two passages. Firstly, since the narrator of *H&H* has carefully left out everything that Hysminias has not experienced himself, Hysmine narrates things that are at this point unknown to Hysminias. She has hinted at them in a letter to Hysminias (*H&H* 9.9), but avoided his questions: οὐ τοῦ νῦν ἐστὶ ταῦτα καιροῦ, "but now is not the time for that" (*H&H* 9.17.2). The significance of Hysmine's part is further underlined by her unwillingness to tell it; the priest of Apollo

<sup>345</sup> See e.g. Fusillo (1991) 178 ("un effet d'autobiographie authentique") and Reardon (1994). One may also note the psychological interest of Chariton, his use of direct speech and focalisation; Fusillo (1997) 216–217. On psychology and "realism" in *H&H*, see Hunger (1968) 72–73, Alexiou (1977) 40–42, and above, pp. 90–91.

<sup>346</sup> See above, pp. 152–153.

<sup>347</sup> Most apparent in *L&K* 8.5; see above, pp. 186–187.

<sup>348</sup> *H&H* 11.11.1; the whole passage is quoted and discussed in pp. 49–50.

has to exhort her twice before she, trembling, starts to speak.<sup>349</sup> Leukippe narrates only part of her story herself, since Kleitophon has already told most of it, “edited” according to his own judgment (*L&K* 8.5.4–6). In *H&H* the illusion is maintained: the reader is kept in suspense along with Hysminias himself. The suspense is hinted at in the very expression “fill out the crescent”, which is a metaphor for the novel’s gradual revelation of “the whole truth”.

Secondly, there is the use of the contrasting terms *drama* in *L&K* and *diegema/diegesis* in *H&H*.<sup>350</sup> The word *drama* is frequently used by Tatius to signify not only doings of varying character, but also real-life enactment (drama in our sense) or performance.<sup>351</sup> In *H&H*, the term *drama* has a tragic tone and denotes, in most cases, a plot, a tragedy, or a conspiracy; *drama* can also, as in Tatius, refer to the narrative content of a painting (the “plot” of a work of art).<sup>352</sup> Makrembolites’ contrasting use of *drama* and *diegema/diegesis* is remarkable: *diegesis* appears only towards the end of the novel, and then only as referring to the *narration* of the protagonists’ experiences,<sup>353</sup> which have earlier been referred to as *drama*.<sup>354</sup> Thus the drama of the couple, as the reader approaches the end, becomes a *diegesis*. The contrast between the two terms is brought to the fore when they are juxtaposed by the priest of Apollo, exhorting Hysmine a second time to tell her story: σὺ δ’ οὐδ’ αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ κατὰ σέ δρᾶμα θύσεις Ἀπόλλωνι, ἵν’ αἰωνίζον εἶη τὸ διήγημα καὶ μὴ φθίνον τὸ τερατούργημα, “will you not make a sacrifice to Apollo even out of your adventures [*drama*], so that the narrative [*diegema*] persists eternally and the miracle does not fade?” (*H&H* 11.12.2)

Since *diegema* implies a structured, although not necessarily written, narration the story of Hysmine and Hysminias is by now, so to speak, “becoming a book”. A similar, and the most important, juxtaposition of the adventures of the protagonists and the written book is made in the closing

<sup>349</sup> *H&H* 11.11–12.

<sup>350</sup> The difference between the two is subtle: *diegesis* denotes primarily an organised narrative or narration; *diegema* signifies most often a story or tale.

<sup>351</sup> See O’Sullivan (1989) s.v. δρᾶμα.

<sup>352</sup> For drama as plot or conspiracy, see *H&H* 6.13.2, 6.16.5, 7.3.2 (cf. *L&K* 2.28.1 for a similar use); as tragic experiences/adventures 8.11.2, 8.14.1 (cf. *L&K* 1.2.2 and *H&H* 10.17.2), 9.10.1, 11.12.2, 11.22.2, 11.22.3, 11.22.4, 11.23.3; as the story or plot depicted in a painting 2.6.1 and 2.8.1 (cf. *L&K* 3.7.9, 3.8.1, 5.5.4). On the use of theatrical terminology and the term drama in Byzantium, see Agapitos (1991) 43–45, 209–211 and (1998b); Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39–49. See also below, pp. 283–284.

<sup>353</sup> *H&H* 10.17.3, 11.2.2 (*diegesis*); 11.1.2, 11.12.2 (*diegema*).

<sup>354</sup> Or just τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, where “experiences” or “adventures” are implied.



*sphragis*: “the title of the book will be the adventures [*drama*] of Hysmine and me, Hysminias.”<sup>355</sup> *Drama* here does not, however, mean only “adventures”, but also signifies a “tragic story” and is thus a generic signal for “erotic fiction”.<sup>356</sup> The use of the term *diegema* in *H&H* 11.11.1 is thus, seen in contrast to *L&K* 8.15.3, a signal to the reader, subverting the effect of the fictionally oral discourse: the narration that will come (Hysmine’s story) is the missing part of the nearly finished book.<sup>357</sup>

### 2.2.7 Characterisation

Tatius’ character drawing has been seen as more vivid and “realistic” than that of his fellow novelists.<sup>358</sup> The art lies mainly in the character development, which the reader is allowed to follow step by step: Leukippe does not instantly fall in love, she is gradually persuaded by Kleitophon’s wooing. In the novel’s sub-plot one can see character development proper, in the drastic *metabole* of Kallisthenes. From being an irresponsible brat he turns into a well-behaved and respectful young man, the cause of this change being love.<sup>359</sup>

As discussed above in chapter 1.2.7, characterisation cannot be considered in isolation: it depends on point of view, types of narrative and rhetorical technique. Tatius and Makrembolites both use first-person viewpoint,<sup>360</sup> they both include descriptive detail, and employ rhetoric to shift from one stylistic level to another. In *H&H*, character development has been augmented to the degree that the maturity process is one of the main themes of

<sup>355</sup> *H&H* 11.23.3; quoted and discussed above, pp. 75–78.

<sup>356</sup> Agapitos (1998a) 145; (2000a) 183–184.

<sup>357</sup> We may also compare the antithesis *mythos-logos* in *L&K* 1.2.2 (σμήνος ἀνεγείρεις [...] λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε, “you are poking up a wasps’ nest of narrative. My life has been very storied”) to *H&H* 8.11.2, where a theatrical vocabulary is employed (τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ζητοῦσα μαθεῖν ὅλον δράμα ζητεῖς καὶ ὅλον τραγῶδημα, “when you ask to know more you are asking for a whole play, a complete tragedy”). For the wasps’ nest in Tatius, see Plato, *Rep.* 5.450b (οὐκ ἔσται ὅσον ἐσμὸν λόγων ἐπεγείρετε). On *mythos* and *logos*, see also Longus’ *D&C* 2.7.1 (πάννυ ἐτέρφθησαν ὥσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούοντες, “they enjoyed this very much, treating it as a story rather than as fact”); cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 523a, *Rep.* 2.376e–377a, and Pindar *Ol.* 1.28–29; see Hunter (1983) 47 and n. 99.

<sup>358</sup> Hägg (1983) 51–54; Reardon (1994); Anderson (1997) 2284–2285.

<sup>359</sup> There is no real parallel to this “psychological realism” in other ancient novels. Even though Chariton showed himself interested in psychology, there is no real change of character in his novel; the situations change, not the persons; Hägg (1983) 53. The only comparable case, I think, would be the development of the protagonists in Longus’ *D&C*, but the maturity process in Longus is closely tied to the seasons, and not an attempt to describe “realistic” change.

<sup>360</sup> But cf. Tatius’ sometimes omniscient viewpoint; see above, pp. 243–244.

the novel. There are, however, also important differences, one of which is that Makrembolites depicts fewer characters than Tatius. This is partly due to the restriction of viewpoint and the limited use of sub-plots, but a more important factor is the compression of the plot: action in *H&H* takes place on an emotional, inner level. We may recall that the erotic pathos in the novel is created as a display of rhetorical discourse and not as a representation of realistic emotions.<sup>361</sup> The characters, even if they act in a psychologically correct manner, should be seen as character “types” rather than individuals.<sup>362</sup> The names that Makrembolites has drawn from *L&K* have already been discussed in chapter 1.2.7. Here we will compare some of the main characters in the two novels: the heroes and heroines, the friends/helpers, and the mistresses.

#### HEROES AND HEROINES

Discussions on the heroes of ancient or Byzantine novels often concern their “anti-heroic” aspects: the young men of the genre are cowards who get their maidens into trouble without being able to help them, and they cry and lament all the time.<sup>363</sup> It may be useful here to look at the definitions of the anti-hero concept. According to Bal, there are three types of heroes: the hero, the hero-victim, and the anti-hero. The hero is successful with an active function; the hero-victim is confronted by obstacles or evil that he does not vanquish; the anti-hero is passive without any active function.<sup>364</sup> According to this definition, neither of the protagonists is an anti-hero, since they both have active functions in the novels. Both the heroes and the heroines of the ancient and Byzantine novels are, however, partly characterised as hero-victims, which is part of the genre (i.e. to be opposed by obstacles and evil). According to David Konstan, the ideal of a hero coming to

<sup>361</sup> See above, pp. 90–91, 165.

<sup>362</sup> On the “types” of characters in the ancient novels, see Billaut (1991) 143–164 and (1996) 117–122; John (1996) 172.

<sup>363</sup> There are numerous examples, starting with Gasellee (1947) 390–391, n. 1 on *L&K* 8.1.2: “the reader, bearing in mind Clitophon’s behaviour at his previous meeting with Thersander (V.xxiii), will by this time have come to the conclusion that the hero of the romance is a coward of the purest water. I do not know if Achilles Tatius intended to depict him so, or whether it is a fault in the drawing.” Cf. Anderson (1997) 2285. A more recent example is Beaton’s ambivalent discussion, (1996<sup>2</sup>) 61–62, where Gasellee is quoted as an example of an out-of-date approach, although Beaton’s own chapter opens with the ironic comment that “the principal characters of the ancient romances very rarely do anything.”

<sup>364</sup> Bal (1985) 92–93.



the rescue of his lady simply does not belong to the so-called “sexual symmetry” of the Greek novel.<sup>365</sup>

It has been argued by Beaton that the passive hero in the ancient novels amounts to the status of a theme, which then has been considerably extended in the Komnenian novels.<sup>366</sup> Beaton explained the extension of the passivity of the hero in relation to the Christian doctrine according to which passive suffering in certain situations is not only a necessity, but also a virtue.<sup>367</sup> The notion of *apatheia* involves, however, more complex issues than passivity, and it also existed before the rise of Christianity.<sup>368</sup> More importantly, the differences between the ancient and Komnenian novel need to be defined: are they in fact so striking?<sup>369</sup> The heroes’ passivity needs to be considered primarily in relation to the role of the heroines, so we will return to it in a while.

The greatest difference in the characterisation of Kleitophon and Hysminias is the emphasis on Hysminias’ inexperience, or even *aporia*, as opposed to Kleitophon’s experience before and in the story.<sup>370</sup> They also find themselves in different situations in the openings of the novels: Kleitophon falls in love at first sight and slowly convinces Leukippe to fall in love with him, whereas Hysminias has to be convinced by Hysmine, Kratisthenes, and even Eros himself.<sup>371</sup> The traditional roles seem to have been reversed: the heroine Hysmine acts like the hero Kleitophon. Another aspect in this context is the oppressed situation of Hysminias as he is being harassed by two women, whereas Hysmine is never threatened by any other man.<sup>372</sup> In this discussion belongs also Hysminias’ change of name (*H&H* 9.14.5). In *L&K*, it is Leukippe who has been deprived of her name: οὐκ εἰμι Θεσσαλή· οὐ καλοῦμαι Λάκαινα. ὕβρις αὐτῇ ἐστὶ πειρατική· λεληστέυμαι καὶ τοῦνομα, “I am not Thessalian, and my name is not Lakaina. This is an

<sup>365</sup> Konstan (1994) 15–26, 30–36, esp. 30, 34. On men and women in the novels, see further below, pp. 255–256.

<sup>366</sup> Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 62 and also 63–64.

<sup>367</sup> Ibid. 64–65.

<sup>368</sup> Agapitos & Smith (1992) 39 and n. 80.

<sup>369</sup> For example, Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 60–61 says that the abduction of Hysmine is the one act in which the hero acts rather than being acted upon, but Hysmine is no less part of the act than was Leukippe, and they are both blamed for the elopement; see e.g. the harsh blame of her father in *H&H* 11.12.3–4. On the abduction motif in the Komnenian novels, see Laiou (1993) 211–213.

<sup>370</sup> See *L&K* 2.37.5.

<sup>371</sup> Cf. Garland (1990) 80: “‘love’ is a very simple concept of instantaneous and mutual attraction, originating solely in physical appearance, and depicted by the irrational force of Eros.”

<sup>372</sup> Cf. Laiou (1993) 212.

insult imposed by pirates who robbed me even of my name" (*L&K* 6.16.5). The things that befall Leukippe—the harassment, the change of name—happen in *H&H* to the hero and not to the heroine. The passivity is in that respect indeed extended, but on a more complex level than Beaton suggests, since it includes cross-wise inversion. In order to study the whole picture, we need to consider also the heroines.

Leukippe is portrayed as a strong-willed girl who knows how to fight for both love and chastity. She is tough, both towards her aggressors<sup>373</sup> and towards Kleitophon.<sup>374</sup> As already mentioned, there is an important difference from the very outset: Hysmine makes the first advances, while Leukippe has to be persuaded. Hysmine is thus more straightforward than Leukippe, and it has been suggested that she may have been partly modelled upon Antheia in the *Ephesiaka*.<sup>375</sup> She does, however, also have traits in common with Leukippe, first of all her looks. Heroines in ancient and Byzantine novels are most often described in a similar manner, set-piece descriptions of female beauty that were imitated by the Byzantines.<sup>376</sup> Tatius' and Makrembolites' ekphraseis are not entirely similar, and the framing is different. Leukippe is described when Kleitophon catches his first sight of her. He compares her to a painting of Selene on a bull that he has once seen:

ὄμμα γοργὸν ἐν ἡδονῇ· κόμη ξανθή, τὸ ξανθὸν οὖλον· ὀφρὺς μέλαινα, τὸ μέλαν ἄκρατον· λευκὴ παρειά, τὸ λευκὸν εἰς μέσον ἐφοινίσσεται καὶ ἐμμεῖτο πορφύραν, εἰς οἷαν τὸν ἐλέφαντα Λυδία βάπτει γυνή· τὸ στόμα ῥόδων ἄνθος ἦν, ὅταν ἄρχηται τὸ ῥόδον ἀνοίγειν τῶν φύλλων τὰ χεῖλη. (*L&K* 1.4.3)

delightfully animated eyes; light blond hair—blond and curly; black eyebrows—jet black; white cheeks—a white that glowed to red in the center like the crimson laid on ivory by Lydian craftswomen. Her mouth was a rose caught at the moment when it begins to part its petal lips.

In fact, it is not clear whether Kleitophon describes the painting of Selene or Leukippe.<sup>377</sup> That ambivalent relation between art and reality is, as we have already seen a number of times now, further augmented in *H&H*, also in the ekphrasis of Hysmine. She is not depicted until Hysminias has begun to fall in love with her, and the description is set in one of his dreams.<sup>378</sup> First of

<sup>373</sup> E.g. when approached by Thersander in *L&K* 6.22.

<sup>374</sup> E.g. *L&K* 5.18.

<sup>375</sup> Alexiou (1977) 35–36.

<sup>376</sup> See Aerts (1997) esp. 151–159, 188–192; on the ancient novels, see Billaut (1991) 121–189 and (1996).

<sup>377</sup> Cf. the descriptions of the paintings of the Virtues in *H&H* 2.2–5.

<sup>378</sup> On the position of this ekphrasis in relation to some other material drawn from *L&K*, see above, p. 194.



all, the description itself is extended into a regular ekphrasis, complete with comments to the reader<sup>379</sup> and artistic perfection. Like Leukippe, Hysmine has lively eyes and black eyebrows, a pale complexion with blushing cheeks, and her lips are likened to roses. The description of Hysmine includes the same artistic symmetry<sup>380</sup> which is emphasised in the description of the fountain, but the blush on her cheek is explicitly not like a piece of art or achieved by art: “not drawn by hand or painted by art or fading overnight and washed off in water.”<sup>381</sup> Hysmine explicitly links herself to the garden,<sup>382</sup> whereas Leukippe was connected with it by Kleitophon.<sup>383</sup> The opposition of, and at the same time equation of, nature and art corresponds with both the ancient and the Byzantine novel’s play on artistic pleasure as expressed in the ekphrasis.<sup>384</sup>

Another direct parallel between Hysmine and Leukippe is in their letters to the heroes. They both reveal their true identity in letters, similar in subject and wording. They ask their lovers to remember what they have suffered for their sake, ending up as slaves,<sup>385</sup> and remind them that they are still virgins.<sup>386</sup> The situations are of course different: Leukippe angrily

<sup>379</sup> *H&H* 3.6.4: εἴποις ἰδὼν ῥόδον ἐκθλίψαι τὴν κόρην τοῖς χεῖλεσι, “seeing her you would say that the girl had crushed a rose with her lips”.

<sup>380</sup> *H&H* 3.6.4: ὅλον τὸ πρόσωπον κύκλος ἀνεπισφαλῆς· ἡ ρὶν κέντρον λόγον ἐπέχει πρὸς ὅλον τὸ κύκλωμα, “her entire face formed a perfect circle; her nose held the central place in the circuit”.

<sup>381</sup> *H&H* 3.6.3: παρειαὶ λευκῇ· τὸ λευκὸν ἄκρατον, ἐς ὅσον οὐκ ἠρυθραίνετο· τὸ μέσον ἐρυθρόν· τὸ ἐρυθρὸν διεσπασμένον καὶ οἶον διεσπαρμένον, οὐχ οἶον πλάττει χεῖρ καὶ τέχνη βάπτει καὶ νύξ μαραίνει καὶ ὕδωρ ἐκπλύνει, “her cheeks were white, unblemished white where there was no mixture of red; the centre was red, red that was separated off and scattered there, not drawn by hand or painted by art or fading overnight and washed off in water”.

<sup>382</sup> E.g. in *H&H* 6.8.3, but see also above, p. 99.

<sup>383</sup> *L&K* 1.19.1–2, Leukippe’s face is described as a meadow; the garden then mirrors her face, cf. *H&H* 4.4.3 and 4.17.2.

<sup>384</sup> See e.g. above, pp. 101–102 and n. 199, and p. 132.

<sup>385</sup> *L&K* 5.18.3–4: ὅσα μὲν διὰ σὲ πέπουθα, οἶδας· ἀνάγκη δὲ νῦν ὑπομνήσαι σε, “you know well all that I have suffered for you, yet now I am obliged to refresh your memory.” *H&H* 9.9.2–3: σὺ δὲ μὴ λήθην νοσήσης [...] διὰ σὲ θανάτου γευσσάμενη πικροῦ καὶ τέλος αἰχμάλωτος καὶ δούλη νῦν, ὥς ὀράς, “you must not succumb to forgetfulness [...], and because of you I tasted bitter death, and finally became a captive and now a slave, as you see”.

<sup>386</sup> *L&K* 5.18.6: ἐγὼ δὲ ἔτι σοι ταῦτα παρθένος, “I write this letter still a virgin.” In *H&H* emphasised by repetition: 9.9.1: καὶ πηγὴ καὶ τόξον Ἀρτέμιδος, παρθένου θεᾶς, παρθένου σοι ταύτην παρεφύλαξατο, “the spring and the bow of Artemis, the virgin goddess, have preserved my virginity for you”, and 9.9.3: καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὴν παρθενίαν ἀπαρεγχείρητος, “but through all this I have kept my virginity inviolate”.

points out that Kleitophon is still free, and even married.<sup>387</sup> Hysmine asks Hysminias to be faithful to their treaty, meaning that they should spare their virginity for each other.<sup>388</sup> The tone is accusing in both letters; although neither of the girls was abducted against her will, the heroes are here made responsible for the maidens' destinies.<sup>389</sup> A difference in the letters signifies yet another inversion as regard the roles of the heroes and heroines. In both novels the heroines' mistresses are in a position to set free and thus save the maidens, but whereas Leukippe in her letter asks Kleitophon to have Melite save her, in *H&H* it is Rhodope who asks Hysminias in another letter to let her free Hysmine in exchange for marriage with Hysminias.<sup>390</sup> Hysmine then has to convince Hysminias that this is indeed the right thing to do, and the two women thus appear as strong and enterprising in contrast to the feeble heroes.

Leukippe and Hysmine both engage in playful dialogues with their lovers, with one difference: Hysmine takes the initiative herself, while Leukippe follows the initiative of Kleitophon. We may compare Kleitophon's first dialogue with Leukippe to Hysminias' first meeting with Hysmine. Kleitophon is reasoning with himself as he tries to build up enough confidence to approach the maiden, *μέχρι τίνος, ἄναυδρε, σιγᾶς; τί δὲ δειλὸς εἰ στρατιώτης ἀνδρείου θεοῦ; τὴν κόρην προσελθεῖν σοὶ περιμένεις*; "how long will you keep silent, sissy boy? What use is a spineless soldier in the service of a virile god? Are you waiting for her to make the first move?" (*L&K* 2.5.1). Suddenly he realises that Leukippe is nearby in the garden.

ὁμως οὖν, ὡς ἂν τεθορυβημένος οὐκ ἔχων τί εἶπω, 'Χαῖρε,' ἔφην, 'δέσποινα.' 2 ἡ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὴ καὶ ἐφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος, ὅτι συνῆκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ Χαῖρε, δέσποινα, εἶπεν· "Ἐγὼ σή; μὴ τοῦτο εἶπης." 'Καὶ μὴν πέπρακέ με τίς σοι θεῶν ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ Ὀμφάλῃ.' 3 'Τὸν Ἑρμῆν λέγεις; τούτῳ τὴν πρᾶσιν ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Ζεὺς,' καὶ ἅμα ἐγέλασε. 'Ποῖον Ἑρμῆν; τί ληρεῖς,' εἶπον, 'εἰδυῖα σαφῶς ὃ λέγω;' ὡς δὲ περιέπλεκον λόγους ἐκ λόγων, τὸ αὐτόματόν μοι συνήργησεν. (*L&K* 2.6)

Yet like one not knowing what to say in my confusion, I said, 'Greetings, my lady.' She smiled a winsome smile; though her amusement said clearly that she understood why I called her 'my lady,' she asked, 'I? Your lady? Don't say that!' 'Ah, but a certain god has sold me into your service as surely as Herakles was sold

<sup>387</sup> *L&K* 5.18.4–5, and note also 5.18.6: ἔρρωσο, καὶ ὄναιο τῶν καινῶν γάμων, "Farewell; be happy in your new marriage".

<sup>388</sup> *H&H* 9.9.3: Ἐρρωσο, καὶ τὰς συνθήκας ἀπαρεγγχειρήτους τηρῶν σωφρόνως ἀντιπαρθένευε, "Farewell, and keeping our vows inviolate, see that you too keep your virginity chaste intact".

<sup>389</sup> Cf. Laiou (1993) 213.

<sup>390</sup> *L&K* 5.18.5; *H&H* 10.2.



as slave to Queen Omphale.' 'You mean Hermes? Whom Zeus ordered to sell Herakles?' And again she smiled. I replied, 'Hermes? Nonsense! You know very well what I mean.' While the conversation was shuttling back and forth like this, circumstances came to my assistance.

Kleitophon then pretends to be stung by a bee and asks Leukippe to cure him with a spell she knows; this leads to the couple's first kiss, and then a digression on the effects of kisses (*L&K* 2.7–8). In *H&H*, the pondering on love that Kleitophon devotes himself to before the first conversation is moved to the later discussions between Hysminias and Kratisthenes.<sup>391</sup> We may especially note Kratisthenes in *H&H* 2.14.4: σὺ δὲ μέχρι πότε λειποταξίου κριθήσῃ τῷ Ἑρωτι; "how long are you going to be condemned for deserting Eros?" which mirrors Kleitophon in *L&K* 2.5.1.<sup>392</sup> Hysminias is indeed, unlike Kleitophon, waiting for Hysmine's moves. Her behaviour when she first meets Hysminias may thus be compared with Kleitophon's in *L&K* 2.6. Hysmine serves the wine at the first banquet, and she takes the opportunity to flirt with the guest herald.

Ἦκεν οὖν ἡ παρθένος καὶ παρατιθεμένη μοι τὸ ποτήριον 'χαίροις' ὑπεψιθύρισε· ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας εἶπον οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἔπιον μεθ' ἡδονῆς, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἐκπωμα μάλα τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πόμα γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ διειδές καὶ μάλα ψυχρόν, ὧν οὔτι γένοιτ' ἂν ἡδύτερον ἀνδρὶ διψῶντι καὶ καυματουμένῳ καὶ ζέοντι. (*H&H* 1.8.3–4)

So the girl came up and, placing the cup beside me, whispered, 'Welcome'. I heard her, though I made no reply but drank with great pleasure because the cup was very delightful and the wine very sweet and the water clear and cold, than which nothing can be more agreeable for a man who is thirsty and very hot and sweaty.

The situation has been reversed, since Hysmine is the one approaching Hysminias with "greetings", as Kleitophon did Leukippe. But Hysminias does not act like Leukippe; he is emotionally cold, burning not with love but with thirst. It is not until later that he answers Hysmine's advances: in *H&H* 4.1, he flirts at dinner, and in 4.3 they meet in the garden for a short dialogue; now that he wants to kiss and cuddle, Hysmine is as chaste as any ancient heroine, defending herself just like Leukippe before her.<sup>393</sup> The tone in *H&H* 4.3 is reminiscent of *L&K* 2.7: kisses are discussed (*H&H* 4.3.2–3), and Hysmine ironically scolds Hysminias for previously "playing the vir-

<sup>391</sup> Especially *H&H* 1.14 and 2.14.

<sup>392</sup> But cf. also both *Anth.* 5.9 and *Ps.* 138.7–10. See also *Vit. Cyr. Phil.* 5.9; above, p. 204, n. 186. Cf. below, 3.3.

<sup>393</sup> See above, p. 160.

gin" when he tries to kiss her (4.3.3).<sup>394</sup> Tatiüs' bee-episode in *L&K* 2.7 (Kleitophon pretending to be stung and Leukippe curing him with her kisses) is mirrored in *H&H* 4.22, where Hysmine bites Hysminias' lips when kissing him, as a revenge for his previous rejection.<sup>395</sup> Hysminias replies with a simile in which Hysmine is a beehive, the erotic imagery known from the *Song of Songs*.<sup>396</sup> The flirtatious and witty tone from *L&K* is echoed in *H&H* as well, for example Hysminias' comment when Hysmine bites him: ἰδοὺ μοι τὰλλα τῶν μελῶν θλιβέστωσαν· τὰ δέ μοι χεῖλη τιμάσθω καθυπουργοῦντά μοι τοῖς φιλήμασιν, "Look, could you crush some other limbs of mine? Have a little respect for those parts which are producing the kisses" (*H&H* 4.22.2).

The strong character and self-confident behaviour of Hysmine is indeed conspicuous.<sup>397</sup> It should, first of all, be seen against the background of the ancient novel.<sup>398</sup> We have already noted that Antheia in the *Ephesiaka* may have been a model for Hysmine,<sup>399</sup> and we have seen here that Leukippe was a strong heroine as well—in fact, most ancient novel heroines are.<sup>400</sup> The female protagonist is often the main character, and Chariton even concludes his novel "that is my story about Kallirhoe".<sup>401</sup> Also female antago-

<sup>394</sup> Cf. also the ironic and witty dialogue in *H&H* 9.23; discussed above, pp. 148–149.

<sup>395</sup> *H&H* 4.22.1: ἀλγείς τὰ χεῖλη; ἀλλ' ἤλγησα καὶ γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅτε μου ταῦτα καὶ σὺ τὸν ἔρωτα προπετῶς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τραπέζης ἐξεφάυλισας, "Do your lips hurt? But my soul was pained too when you so precipitously spurned my love at my father's banquet."

<sup>396</sup> *H&H*: 4.22.3: εἰ δέ μοι κέντρον φέρεις ὡς μέλιττα καὶ φυλάττεις τὸ σίμβλον καὶ πλήττεις τὸν τοῦ μέλιτος τρυγητήν, ἐγκαρτερήσω τῷ σίμβλῳ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ κέντρον πόνον ὑφέξω καὶ τρυγήσω τοῦ μέλιτος· οὐ γὰρ με στερήσει πόνος γλυκύτητος μέλιτος, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἄκανθα ῥόδου τοῦ ῥόδου κωλύσει με, "if you are wielding a sting at me like a bee and are guarding your hive and are lashing out at the honey thief, I will dally round the hive, put up with the pain from the sting and cull the honey. For the pain will not deprive me of the honey's sweetness, as the rose's thorns do not turn me away from the rose." The imagery of the beehive is frequently used in *H&H*; see also e.g. 4.25.2, 4.3.4, 5.20.1, 6.8.2, 7.8.2, 9.22.3, 10.10.6. On the use of the *Song*, see below, pp. 279–280.

<sup>397</sup> Dunlop (1888) 77 described Hysmine as "avowing love without modesty and without delicacy". But Hysmine remains chaste; on virginity in *H&H* see Garland (1990) 74–75.

<sup>398</sup> On women in the ancient novel, see Wiersma (1990), Egger (1988, 1994), Kaimio (1995), and Johne (1996) esp. 187–189 on *L&K*; in the Byzantine novel, see Garland (1990) and Smith (1999) 183–194.

<sup>399</sup> Alexiou (1977) 35–36; see above, p. 251.

<sup>400</sup> See Wiersma (1990); Egger (1994); Kaimio (1995) esp. pp. 129–130.

<sup>401</sup> See above, p. 190, n. 125. Cf. Rohde (1914<sup>3</sup>) 355–356 on the better characterisation of female figures.



nists are often depicted as strong characters, for example Melite in *L&K*.<sup>402</sup> Irrespective of the underlying reasons for the portrayal of women in the novels,<sup>403</sup> the strong heroines correspond to the “helpless heroes” discussed above; together they display the “erotic balance” of male and female roles in a story.<sup>404</sup> Likewise, one may argue that Hysmine’s behaviour reflects a contemporary view of women, influenced by Christianity.<sup>405</sup>

However, on a literary level the conventions are not as upturned as they may seem: the strength of the heroine and the passivity of the hero are *extended*, and there has accordingly been an inversion of the female and male roles, so that the Komnenian heroine performs the actions of the ancient hero. Such a treatment of elements from the ancient novel corresponds with other amplifications and inversions that we have looked at in this study. The function and effects of such manipulation of material lie on a metatextual, rather than a factual level; the characterisation of Hysmine is therefore not necessarily tied to a contemporary socio-cultural situation.<sup>406</sup>

#### FRIENDS AND HELPERS

Hysminias’ helper is Kratisthenes, a friend and cousin who travels with him on his embassy to Aulikomis, and later arranges his and Hysmine’s escape from Eurykomis. Hysminias has no slave or servant (neither has Hysmine any chambermaid), so while Kleitophon had two advisors and helpers in his quest for love, Satyros and Kleinias, Hysminias has only one. Apart from being a relative and a friend, we know nothing about Kratisthenes, whereas Kleinias is described through both Kleitophon’s narrative and his own

<sup>402</sup> On Melite, see Egger (1994) 267–268; Segal (1994).

<sup>403</sup> Wiersma (1990) sees it as a combination of traditional values and the prominent role of elite women; Egger (1994) as mirroring women’s erotic power as opposed to factual helplessness, “the novels work with the principle of emotional gynocentrism, but factual androcentrism”, *ibid.* p. 272. Kaimio (1995) stresses the sensible matter-of-fact behaviour of Kallirhoe, which, according to her, mirrors that of real women and attracts female readers. On women as readers and, possibly, authors, see also John (1996) 156–164.

<sup>404</sup> Cf. Konstan (1994) on “sexual symmetry”, and Lowe (2000) 225–227 on “erotic competition”.

<sup>405</sup> See Garland (1990); Smith (1999) 183–194. On eroticism and constraint, i.e. *erotica* in a repressed society, see Beck (1977, 1984); Garland, *ibid.* 66–67 and n. 20.

<sup>406</sup> The area needs careful investigation in order to avoid simplistic or one-sided statements, as e.g. Garland (1990) esp. 80–81. It does seem like attitudes towards women changed during the Byzantine period, see e.g. Laiou (1981, 1985, 1992) and (1993) 109–221; Garland (1988, 1990). There is now a growing number of studies of women in Byzantium, with a certain emphasis on the imperial sphere; see e.g. James (1997); Hill (1999); Gouma-Peterson (2000). See also the on-line bibliography at

<http://www.wooster.edu/Art/wb.html>.

words. He too is a relative, and he is older and more experienced in love than Kleitophon;<sup>407</sup> an important difference is that Kleinias prefers boys to women.<sup>408</sup> We are not explicitly told that Kratisthenes is older or more experienced than Hysminias, but it is clear from their conversations and Kratisthenes' sometimes rather patronising attitude that he is.

Kratisthenes' advice is never as long or detailed as Kleinias'. Kleinias offers Kleitophon a lengthy explanation when he first seeks advice (*L&K* 1.7–9). Kleitophon's question, τί λέγω; τί ποιῶ; πῶς ἂν τύχοιμι τῆς ἐρωμένης; οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδοὺς, "but what do I say? What do I do? How can I reach my beloved? I flounder in ignorance of *method*" (1.9.7) is answered by the not so comforting μηδὲν πρὸς ταῦτα ζήτηι παρ' ἄλλου μαθεῖν· αὐτοδίδακτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σοφιστής, "don't look to learn this from anyone else; this god is a self-taught scholar" (1.10.1). Kleinias, however, then goes on to discuss how to proceed (1.10). The passage is echoed in a condensed version in *H&H*, where Kratisthenes asks Hysminias what happened at the dinner when Hysmine was flirting with him. In the passage, which has already been quoted and discussed above, Hysminias expresses his *aporia* and asks who will teach him about love. Kratisthenes answers ironically with an allusion to Hippocrates: "animal nature cannot be taught", reflecting at the same time the "self-taught sophist" of Tatius.<sup>409</sup> The discussion is not continued until the next evening, when Kratisthenes again asks Hysminias to relate what happened at dinner, and again teases him and tells him that he cannot escape the power of Eros (*H&H* 2.14.4–6). We must remember the important difference between the novels: while Kleitophon's *aporia* is concerned with what to do in order to make the girl fall in love, Hysminias is just utterly at loss about what to do at all.

While Kleinias gives Kleitophon metaphysical and philosophical information on love, Satyros assists him on a more practical level. He helps Kleitophon to find a subject for his digression on the nature of love in order to impress Leukippe (*L&K* 1.16–17); he encourages meetings in the garden (2.10) and in Leukippe's bedroom (2.19–25), and the game with the drinking

<sup>407</sup> *L&K* 1.7.1: ἦν δέ μοι Κλεινίας ἀνεψιός, ὀρφανὸς καὶ νέος, δύο ἀναβεβηκώς ἔτη τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς ἐμῆς, ἔρωτι τετελεσμένος, "I had a cousin named Kleinias, whose parents both were dead; he was two years older than myself and already an initiate in the rites of love." See above, p. 177 and n. 55 on the exclusion of homoerotic material in *H&H*.

<sup>408</sup> *L&K* 1.7.1 (he was in love with a boy), 1.12–14 (the boy gets killed by the horse Kleinias gave him), 2.34–38 (discussion with Kleitophon and Menelaus on hetero- and homosexual love). From Kratisthenes' discourses on love, we may assume that he is not interested in boys, but some misogynistic thoughts are included in *H&H* 3.9.5–6.

<sup>409</sup> *H&H* 1.14.5; see above, pp. 123–124, 148, 273.



cups (2.9). He follows the couple on their escape, and in Egypt he saves Leukippe (together with Menelaus) by arranging the fake sacrifice (3.15–22).<sup>410</sup> Kratisthenes too gives some practical assistance: he tells Hysminias to be quiet in order to avoid embarrassment (*H&H* 1.10.3, 2.12.2); he keeps an eye on the couple in the garden so that they will avoid detection (4.4.1–2; cf. *L&K* 2.10). He assists in a game with the drinking-cups (5.10–12), quite similar to that of Satyros.<sup>411</sup> Kratisthenes' main function is, however, to interpret the paintings in the garden.

Kratisthenes accordingly takes up the functions of both Kleinias and Satyros: he teaches Hysminias about love, like Kleinias, and he assists him in his pursuit, like Satyros. Ultimately, it is the paintings in the garden that instruct Hysminias, but without Kratisthenes as a guide and interpreter, Hysminias would not have understood them. Even if Kleinias and Satyros follow Kleitophon longer than Hysminias is accompanied by Kratisthenes, who disappears already on the ship, they too are forgotten in the end of the story; we do not know what happened to them. Helpers are obviously important only when they are of immediate help.<sup>412</sup>

#### MISTRESSES

Melite, the passionate widow who seduces Kleitophon, is depicted not only as determined to get what she wants, but also, perhaps surprisingly, as sympathetic.<sup>413</sup> For example, she helps Leukippe (without knowing, however, that the girl is Kleitophon's fiancée) to escape the lusty Sosthenes, as one woman helping another (*L&K* 5.17.3–4). Her feelings for Kleitophon are depicted as sincere, even if mainly sexual. There are two characters in *H&H* that correspond to Melite: Hysminias' nameless mistress and Hysmine's mistress Rhodope. The situations in the two novels are very different: whereas Hysminias is already a slave himself when he finds out that Rhodope's slave-girl is Hysmine, Kleitophon is never enslaved, his marriage to Melite is his own decision and he is never, as most novel heroes usually are, harassed by a mistress. Here we have a parallel to Hysmine's situation: like Kleitophon, she is never harassed by any master or by any pirates.

<sup>410</sup> On Satyros, see Anderson (1988).

<sup>411</sup> See above, p. 229.

<sup>412</sup> On the helper function, see above, p. 162.

<sup>413</sup> Usually, the characters threatening the protagonists' chastity are not positively portrayed; see e.g. Arsake in Heliodoros, or in *L&K* Leukippe's aggressor Thersander. On the pairing and contrasting of Melite and Leukippe, see Segal (1984).

There is one similarity in the two heroes' situation: each is desired by the woman who is now the mistress of his beloved. The roles of the girls' mistresses as helpers is thus interesting. In *L&K*, Leukippe in her letter asked Kleitophon to let Melite save her and send her back to Byzantium;<sup>414</sup> Melite had by then in fact already saved Leukippe once from Sosthenes. The help from Melite turns out to be different from what Leukippe had in mind: in exchange for helping him and Leukippe to escape, Kleitophon makes love to Melite. Leukippe, however, never finds out about it. In *H&H*, Rhodope offers Hysminias freedom in exchange for love in a similar manner (*H&H* 10.12). Hysmine supports Rhodope's feelings for Hysminias as a way of saving them both (9.19; 9.22.3–9.23), and although Hysminias is unwilling at first, he is persuaded by Hysmine to accept Rhodope's invitation (10.1). However, while Kleitophon was in fact seduced by Melite, Hysminias is not even touched by Rhodope, since she uses Hysmine as her *mediatrix*. Nor does he allow himself to be tricked into anything by his own mistress, however persistent she is; just like Hysmine, he is perfectly untouched and chaste. The contrast between the women's sexual aggressiveness and the hero's virginity is sharp; due to the inversion of the male and female roles it is indeed sharper than is the same contrast in the portrayal of Leukippe.

We may also note here how the two female characters in *H&H* (Rhodope and mistress) correspond to one single character in *L&K* (Melite), whereas earlier we saw an example of one character in *H&H* (Kratisthenes) corresponding to two characters in *L&K* (Kleinias and Satyros). Makrembolites employs amplification or repression, in this case apparently depending upon the effect wanted: in *H&H* there is one more woman to pursue Hysminias in order to underline the situation of the oppressed hero, but there is only one helper who embodies the characteristics of both the ancient friend and servant along the lines of the compressed intrigue.

Even though Makrembolites has drawn both names and characteristics from the characters of *L&K*, there is no exact correspondence. Tatius' characters have been transformed: the functions of character types are changed and cross-wise inverted so that, for example, the hero and the heroine so to speak "play new roles". The first impression of Makrembolites' characters may be one of vagueness, the reasons for which are probably the restricted point of view and the compressed plot. The narrator never gives the reader any background information about any character, in contrast to, for example, the detailed story about Kleinias' boyfriend in *L&K* 1.7–14. No such infor-

<sup>414</sup> *L&K* 5.18; see above, p. 253.



mation is given even about Hysmine, but thanks to Hysminias' focus on her, the reader is given the impression of knowing her better than the other characters. The vagueness in characterisation may be compared to the vagueness of fictional space: it emphasises the protagonists at the cost of peripheral characters, and brings the hero and heroine to the fore.

This vagueness does not necessarily entail less lively or less "realistic" characters. Tatius and Makrembolites employ the same rhetorical technique of shifting from one level of style to another in order to characterise the speech of different characters. There is no indecent detail attached to Makrembolites' protagonists—both extremely chaste—but that does not make them less sexy: speech and behaviour rather enhance the eroticism of both hero and heroine. The explicit descriptions of erotic encounters are, of course, an important factor here, but the amplification of ancient novel character types and the inversion of male and female roles in particular underline the overt eroticism.<sup>415</sup> Makrembolites' use of *L&K* as a hypotext also in the construction of character adds an intertextual aspect that is often amusing. The irony in *H&H* is part of the metatextual situation, and as we will see in Part 3, the use of quotation and allusion often enhances the ironic character of a passage.

---

<sup>415</sup> See, e.g. the imagery of the male and female palm; above, pp. 235–236.

## PART THREE

# Mimesis and Transtextuality: Tradition and Innovation

An important part of imitation in antiquity and in Byzantium was the use of quotation of and allusion to the “classics”. Imitation of excellent Attic examples was recommended as a way to acquire skill in rhetoric, and it must be firmly distinguished from plagiarism.<sup>1</sup> Traditional imitation does not primarily concern what an author says, but *how* he says it.<sup>2</sup> For example, Demetrius in his treatise *On Style* discusses the difference between Herodotus and Thucydides: the first quotes whole passages, which is not appreciated, whereas the latter adapts an Homeric epithet in a different context, which is praised.<sup>3</sup>

The use of ancient quotations, allusions and *topoi* in *Hysmine & Hysminias* was investigated already forty years ago by Gigante (1960). Gigante argued that the novel is nothing but “un gioco letterario”, a play on words and allusions. He also interpreted the novel’s purpose as ironic and parodic.<sup>4</sup> Gigante’s investigation is still a very important study, on which my own

---

<sup>1</sup> On imitation in antiquity, see McKeon (1952) and Clark (1957) 144–176; on imitation in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, both in Byzantium and in the West, see Cizek (1994) esp. 11–20; on Byzantine mimesis, see Hunger (1969/70) and (1981). Plagiarism was opposed to imitation and despised already in antiquity; a *plagiarius* is mentioned in Martial’s *Epigrams* 1.52, and in 1.53 such a person is called a thief; Clark, *ibid.* 145. On modern concepts of imitation, see above, p. 24, n. 74, and pp. 43–44, 166–169.

<sup>2</sup> McKeon (1952); Clark (1957) 145. Cf. Conte (1986) esp. 52–69 and his term “poetic memory”, which refers to the more traditional “intertextuality”. Cf. also MacAlister (1994b, 1996) on Bakhtin’s concept of “alien speech” which designates the pieces of ancient (and maybe also contemporary) literature inserted by an author into his own work, manipulating it to fit his own purposes. This notion is, of course, applicable to all allusions and, particularly, to quotations in *H&H*. On MacAlister’s use of Bakhtin’s concept, see Beaton (1997) 235–236.

<sup>3</sup> Demetrius, *On Style* (Περὶ ἐρμηνείας) 112–113; Clark (1957) 146–147. Note esp. *On Style* 113: Θουκυδίδης μέντοι κἂν λάβῃ παρὰ ποιητοῦ τι, ἰδίως αὐτῷ χρώμενος ἴδιον τὸ ληφθὲν ποιεῖ, “Thucydides, even if he does borrow something from a poet, uses it in his own way and thus makes it his own property.”

<sup>4</sup> Gigante (1960) 169. Cf. the interpretations of *L&K* as a parody or pastiche; see above, p. 170, n. 25.



and many others' identification of quotations is dependent. But to say that Makrembolites quoted this or that author or work is not very illuminating in itself.<sup>5</sup> Nor does it mean that we can establish with any certainty which literary works the author has read, since he probably relied partly on second-hand sources, *gnomologia* and *florilegia*.<sup>6</sup>

What we can try to establish is some kind of understanding of the use that an author makes of his borrowed material. We therefore need to look at the context in which the ancient texts have been embedded rather than at the ancient material itself. We have already, in Parts 1 and 2, seen a number of examples of Makrembolites' insertion of ancient material, and the significance of that material in the new context has been commented upon. In this last part of the study I will concentrate on the technique that is employed on a textual level, which will help to elucidate the displacement of meaning that has previously been discussed. It will accordingly not be attempted here to list again Makrembolites' ancient sources or identify all of his quotations,<sup>7</sup> but to give a general picture of his allusion and quotation technique and to discuss some general problems of *Quellenforschung*.

### 3.1 Allusion to ancient literature

Allusion has been defined as a "deliberate incorporation of identifiable elements from other sources, preceding or contemporaneous, textual or extra-textual".<sup>8</sup> There are three main functions of allusion that are relevant also—or in particular—in a Byzantine context: the display of knowledge, the appeal to those sharing experience or knowledge with the author, and the enrichment of a literary work by the incorporation of further meaning.<sup>9</sup> Allusion thus usually presumes a close relation between the author and his audience, a shared knowledge and a prizing of tradition, in order to appreciate the device.<sup>10</sup> There are a number of different kinds of allusions, but it will

<sup>5</sup> On *Quellenforschung*, see e.g. Conte (1986) 23 (as above, p. 169, n. 20), and also Ljubarskij et al. (1998) and Agapitos (2000b) 7, 9 and n. 43. On constructive *Quellenforschung* and its importance for textual criticism, see Kolovou (1998) and Reinsch (1998).

<sup>6</sup> For an example of such deceptive *Quellenforschung*, see Agapitos (2000b) 7–9 on *H&H* 4.15.1. Cf. below, p. 270, n. 51.

<sup>7</sup> Besides Gigante (1960), see also Hilberg (1876) 227–231, Plepelits (1989), and Conca (1994a).

<sup>8</sup> Miner (1993) 39. Cf. Conte (1986) 32–39 (esp. 38–39 on the art of allusion) and 52–69 on allusion and rhetorical figures.

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. Kazhdan & Epstein (1985) 138–141, esp. 139–140 on the Byzantines' "art of allusion". See also Hunger (1969/70) esp. 29–30.

<sup>10</sup> Miner (1993) 39–40. See also above, p. 33, on literary circles and *theatra* in Constantinople.

suffice for us here to discuss the *imitative* kind with its three categories: *specific*, *generic*, and *parodic*; they may also be *synthetic*, i.e. a combination of two or three of these categories.<sup>11</sup>

The most frequent kind of allusions in *Hysmine & Hysminias* are those to *Leukippe & Kleitophon*. A large number of these were discussed in Part 2, and as we saw there they most often pick up part of a phrase or just the tone in a passage and use amplification or, in some cases, condensation, in order to adapt the material to the Byzantine novel. For example, Satyros once gives Kleitophon some advice on how to court Leukippe: he must approach her, Satyros says, and then *θίγε χεῖρός, θλίψον δάκτυλον, θλίβων στέναξον*, “touch her hand, press her fingers, and sigh while you press” (*L&K* 2.4.4).<sup>12</sup> In *H&H*, it is Hysmine who follows the advice: *ἡ δὲ τὸν δάκτυλον ἐπιθλίβει μου καὶ θλίβουσα στένει*, “and she presses my finger, and while she presses she sighs” (*H&H* 1.11.3).<sup>13</sup> The allusions to Tattius (which are most often specific, but may also be synthetic) should be distinguished from allusions to other ancient authors. Since *L&K* is the main hypotext of *H&H*, the allusions to Tattius sustain the whole imitative process, and they are thus highly significant to the reader’s understanding of the novel as a hypertext.

There are two kinds of allusions to other ancient authors in *H&H*: those that refer to a specific passage or story, and accordingly are specific, and those that refer to a literary tradition in a broader sense, which are generic. We have earlier investigated the garden ekphrasis, in which two specific allusions are embedded: the narrator explicitly refers to the garden of Alcinous (*H&H* 1.4.3) and to the golden chain of Homer (1.4.4).<sup>14</sup> The explicit references to Homer are significant, since the garden ekphrasis as a *topos* is implicitly modelled upon the garden of Alcinous, and the narrator thus emphasises something that the reader already knows, or should know. The garden description is a generic allusion, since as a *topos* it refers to the whole Homeric tradition. The garden *topos* is, however, somewhat ambiguous due to the novelistic context, and we must ask ourselves whether a Byzantine reader confronted with Makrembolites’ garden would really think of the Homeric garden rather than of gardens in ancient novels. Unless he did, it is

<sup>11</sup> The other kinds are *topical*, *personal*, *formal*, *metaphorical*, and *structural* allusions; *ibid.* 39.

<sup>12</sup> I have modified Winkler’s translation here.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. pp. 254–256 above on the reversed roles of the protagonists.

<sup>14</sup> See above, pp. 86, 100–101, 211.



possible that the allusion to Alcinous, along with the reference to Homer's golden chain, in fact is some way of redirecting an expected (or suspected) reader-response. In that case, i.e., if the author's intended association is that to Homer, the specific allusions are used to "correct" the effect of the generic *topos* allusion. The garden of Sosthenes is thus more than just any novelistic garden: it constitutes a link to the literary tradition of Homer and to Neoplatonism, and it generates, through its paintings, the erotic development of the plot.

Generic allusion in *H&H* is (besides the novelistic *topoi* and references) represented mainly by references to the Homeric tradition. However, as already mentioned, the philologist's endeavour to identify sources may lead to misinterpretations of the text. The use of Homeric words does not necessarily allude to a Homeric passage or episode. In *H&H* 6.18, for example, the Sirens (μέλος ἁδούτων οἶον Σειρήνες ἄδουσι) are not only an allusion to the *Odyssey*, but have an important internal function: to emphasise the imminent threat of the sea.<sup>15</sup> If we read the words exclusively as an Homeric allusion, we miss an important narrative marker. Homeric words may also be used in a symbolic sense without alluding to a specific passage, for example the lotus in *H&H* 5.1.3.

ὁ δέ τις αὐτῶν ὅλον βαλανεῖον ἐδημιούργησε καὶ μοι τὴν Ὑσμίνην συνέλουσε καὶ πάσας ἐρωτικὰς ἐξέκένωσε χάριτας· περὶ τὸ στῆθος τῆς κόρης ὅλον μοι τὸ στόμα συνέρραψε τοῖς ὁδοῦσι δάκνουν, τοῖς χεῖλεσιν ἐκμυζῶν καὶ τῇ γλώσσει μεταβιβάζον εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τὸν λωτόν· ἂ πάνθ' ἡ κόρη περὶ τὸν ἐμὸν ἀντέπραττε τράχηλον. (*H&H* 5.1.3)

Another of the dreams created a whole bath house and had me bathing with Hysmine and passionately poured out all delights: my entire mouth was stitched to the girl's breast, biting with my teeth, sucking with my lips, with my tongue conveying the lotus into my soul;<sup>16</sup> all this the girl reciprocated on my neck.

The allusion here is not directly to the lotophages of the *Odyssey*, but to the known character and effects of the lotus: it smells good, it may be eaten and it makes people forget.<sup>17</sup> Hysminias does not eat the lotus, but transfers it into his soul; the (sexual) pleasure, like the lotus, makes him forget everything else. The erotic imagery is maintained in the following paragraph, in which the girl's breasts are like fountains: οὕς τῷ στόματι παραθέμενος τῆς ψυχῆς μοι τὸ καῦμα κατέψυχε, ψυχρὰν ἡδονὴν πηγάζων γλυκυτέραν

<sup>15</sup> Discussed above, pp. 67–68.

<sup>16</sup> This is my interpretation. It is in fact not entirely clear to whose soul the lotus is transferred; the words may also be interpreted as "into her soul". In either case the lotus functions as a symbol of erotic pleasure.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Conca (1994a) 564: "palese richiamo a *Odissea*, IX 82–102".

καὶ νέκταρος, “pressing these to my mouth it doused my soul’s heat in the springs of icy pleasure that were sweeter than nectar” (*H&H* 5.1.4).

One may also need to consider whether the uses of Homeric words should be read as allusions or as stylistic devices. Most often epithets are part of the style, for example Mycenae’s epithet “rich in gold”<sup>18</sup> or the epithet “fair in women” of Aulikomis.<sup>19</sup> The same applies to the insertion of Homeric words, i.e. they function not as allusions but as stylistic devices, for example the “shield of seven ox hides” which in *H&H* refers to a protection of virginity.<sup>20</sup> In *H&H* 2.4.5, the epithet of the north wind, “scion of clear skies”, is even attached to a quotation from Hesiod.<sup>21</sup> There are, however, also instances where the knowledge of a word’s specific meaning is essential in the new context, for example “Aphrodite’s girdle” in *H&H* 2.7.3.<sup>22</sup> The girdle was a gift to Hera from Aphrodite, and made whoever wore it beautiful and attractive. Since it is here used of Eros’ exquisite beauty, the story behind the word is essential for the understanding of the passage.

An exception to the use of Homeric epithets as stylistic devices is *H&H* 7.12.4, where Hysminias calls himself πολύτλας, “the much-enduring”, the traditional epithet of Odysseus. The difference lies in the surrounding Homeric situation with which the epithet interacts, creating a dramatic intertextual effect of Ἰλιάς κακῶν, an “*Iliad* of woes”.<sup>23</sup> The “much-enduring” is thus not just a stylistic epithet, but creates a (most probably humoristic or ironic) bond between Hysminias and the epic hero. A similar case is that where a Homeric formulaic verse is used when Hysminias is asked about his story: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἥδὲ τοκῆς; “Who are you? Where are you from? What is your country and your parents?” (*H&H* 8.11.2)<sup>24</sup> The epic formula is metrically rendered, which makes it function not only as an epic introduction device, but as a direct allusion to Odysseus.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *H&H* 2.7.1: πολύχρυσος; cf. *Il.* 7.180; 11.46; *Od.* 3.305.

<sup>19</sup> *H&H* 5.7.2: καλλιγύναικα; cf. *Il.* 3.75, 3.258 of Achaia; 2.683, 9.447 of Hellas.

<sup>20</sup> *H&H* 4.23.2: ἀσπίς ἑπταβόειος; cf. *Il.* 7.219–223.

<sup>21</sup> *H&H* 2.4.5: διὰ γάρ τοι παρθενικῆς ἀπαλόχροος οὐ διάησιw αἰθρηγενέτης βορρᾶς, “but the north wind, scion of clear skies, did not whistle through the maiden’s tender flesh.” Cf. Hesiod, *Erga* 519; for αἰθρηγενέτης, cf. *Od.* 5.296. See below, pp. 271–272.

<sup>22</sup> For κεστὸς Ἀφροδίτης cf. *Il.* 14.214–221.

<sup>23</sup> See above, p. 218 and n. 251.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Od.* 1.170, 10.325, 14.187, 15.264, 19.105, 24.298.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *L&K* 1.3.1, where the answer is used as an introduction of the hero without the explicit question being asked.



Another case of allusion is Makrembolites' insertion of Theocritus' ἱγγες ἐρωτικάί, the wrynecks or "erotic charms".<sup>26</sup> When Kratisthenes realises just how ignorant Hysminias is in erotic matters, he exclaims: Ἡράκλεις, τῆς ἀτοπίας, τῆς ἡλιθιότητος· ἀλλ' ἰλέως σοι Ἔρως, μήτηρ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ ἱγγες ἐρωτικάί, "by Heracles, what an idiot, what a dolt! May Eros and his mother Aphrodite and all the erotic charms be kind to you" (*H&H* 1.14.5). The use of the word ἱγγες may not in itself seem significant enough to function as an allusion to Theocritus, but in *H&H* 4.3.3 there is a complete metrical quotation from Theocritus' *Id.* 3.20,<sup>27</sup> which, even if it may be drawn from the *gnomologia*, strengthens the suspicion that *H&H* 1.14.5 does indeed allude to Theocritus' wryneck. Furthermore, in book 9 Hysminias makes a clear allusion to Theocritus when he narrates what happened at the dinner in Artykomis, where Hysmine is secretly present: ἐπὶ δὴ τούτοις πᾶσιν ὀφθαλμὸς ἡλατό μεν ὁ δεξιός, καὶ ἦν μοι τὸ σημεῖον ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ προμάντευμα δεξιώτατον, "my right eye gave a start at all this, and this was for me a good sign and a most auspicious omen" (9.4.1).<sup>28</sup> According to the ancient tradition, an eye twitching is a good omen which means that one will meet a good friend or a beloved.<sup>29</sup> Makrembolites' use of the allusion thus presupposes a knowledge of the original context.

A series of allusions like this strengthens the significance of the author or work being quoted, and must be considered together. Even if an author drew the quotations from and based his allusions on material found in *gnomologia*, the quotations in *gnomologia* were not anonymous. He could thus allude to a work or a corpus in a "correct" way without being familiar with the entire work.<sup>30</sup> We should also remember here that the Komnenian novelist Eugenianos used Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe* as a partial hypotext of his *Drosilla & Charikles*, and that Longus made extensive use of Theocritus.<sup>31</sup> Theocritus is thus not an unknown author in Makrembolites' literary and cultural milieu.

<sup>26</sup> *H&H* 1.14.5; cf. Theocritus, *Id.* 2.

<sup>27</sup> Theocritus, *Id.* 3.20: ἔστι καὶ ἐν κενοῖσι φιλάμασιν ἀδέα τέρψις, "even in empty kisses is there sweet delight."

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Theocritus, *Id.* 3.37: ἄλλεται ὀφθαλμός μεν ὁ δεξιός, "my right eye gives a start."

<sup>29</sup> Conca (1994a) 636 n. 4 quotes a scholion to Theocritus: δοκοῦσιν ὄψεσθαι τινα τῶν οἰκείων, ἂν ἄλλωνται οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, "if their eyes twitch, they think that they will see someone they know."

<sup>30</sup> Cf. below, p. 270 and n. 51 on the *Hippolytus*.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. the use of ἱγγες in Eugenianos' *D&C* 6.416–419 and 8.242. See above, p. 35 and n. 149 on Eugenianos and Longus.

It is also probable that there are in *H&H* a number of allusions to ancient or Byzantine texts which have not come down to us. Then again, references do not necessarily go back to literature, but may also reflect contemporary on-going discussions among the intellectuals. The reference to the river Rhine<sup>32</sup> or the names of the fictional locations may be such “lost allusions”.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps information that will help us understand these questions will come forth as research continues to unveil Byzantine culture, but for now there are a number of such elements in *H&H* that we cannot explain. Furthermore, allusions may refer to other artistic forms, such as works of art. For example, the paintings of the months reflect an extensive tradition of calendar representation both in art and literature, culminating in the twelfth century.<sup>34</sup>

### 3.2 Quotation of ancient literature

The use of quotations intensifies the impact of imitation, and it is thus an important part of Byzantine literature.<sup>35</sup> Byzantine texts often contain a mass of quotations, which gives an impression even of mannerism;<sup>36</sup> *H&H* is one of them. Makrembolites displays quotations of a wide range of authors and genres; those from tragedy, Hesiod, and Homer dominate. Due to the importance of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as school texts, references to Homer are very common in all Byzantine literature.<sup>37</sup> Euripides’ *Hecuba* is quoted very frequently (ten times) in *H&H* and alluded to a number of times.<sup>38</sup> Five other Euripidean plays are quoted,<sup>39</sup> along with a couple of Sophoclean

<sup>32</sup> *H&H* 8.7.1; on the Rhine, see above, p. 140 and n. 344, and pp. 221–222.

<sup>33</sup> See above, pp. 140 and 241.

<sup>34</sup> See above, p. 127, n. 284. Note also the possible implications of the garden ekphrasis as alluding to an actual recital situation; cf. Magdalino (1993) 352 on the garden imagery of Manganeios Prodromos (poem 41) and the recital of his poems in Constantinople.

<sup>35</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 29. On Homer in Byzantium, see Browning (1975b).

<sup>36</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 30.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. Wilson (1996<sup>2</sup>) 18–27 on the ancient authors as school texts.

<sup>38</sup> *H&H* 2.11.3 (*Hec.* 255); 4.24.4 (*Hec.* 228); 5.3.8 (*Hec.* 886–887); 5.5.1 (*Hec.* 72); 6.7.1 (*Hec.* 413); 6.10.4 (*Hec.* 96); 6.13.2 (*Hec.* 1226–1227); 7.13.1 (*Hec.* 607–608); 8.12.2 (*Hec.* 607–608); 8.14.2 (*Hec.* 375–376). See also the allusions to the same tragedy in *H&H* 3.1.4 (cf. *Hec.* 245, 752, 787, 839; see also *Il.* 1.500); 4.21.3 (cf. *Hec.* 398); 5.3.8 (cf. *Hec.* 981–1046); 6.8.1 (cf. *Hec.* 280–281); 11.5.3 (cf. *Hec.* 612). Only one of these quotations is introduced as such; *H&H* 7.13.1: κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν, “according to the tragedy”.

<sup>39</sup> *H&H* 3.9.6 (*Med.* 408–409); 8.21.3 (*Med.* 54–55); 9.23.1 (*Med.* 265–266); 6.15.2 (cf. *Phoen.* 355); 6.15.3 (*Phoen.* 469); 3.3.3 (cf. *Hipp.* 439); 10.6.5 (*Hipp.* 415–416). See also the allusions, or possibly adapted quotations, in 7.18.2 (cf. *Phoen.* 618); 4.15.1 (cf. *Hipp.* 219); 7.17.1 (cf. *Hipp.* 828); 10.11.2 (cf. *Hipp.* 828); 10.10.3 (cf. *Suppl.* 826–827); 10.10.3 (cf. *Alc.* 512). On the *Hippolytus*, see also below, p. 270, n. 51.



tragedies<sup>40</sup> and Aeschylus' *Prometheus*.<sup>41</sup> There are also two quotations from Aristophanes in the novel.<sup>42</sup> Quotations of plays supposedly read in full, i.e. the so-called "Byzantine triad", should be distinguished from quotations from other plays, which are more likely to have been drawn from the *gnomologia* or other second-hand sources. The *Hecuba*, for example, was a triad play, which means that Makrembolites had most probably read it and knew it well.<sup>43</sup> If a play has been read in full this means that the author who quotes or alludes to it is aware not only of the passage in question, but also of its original context, which means that the direct, intertextual bond is stronger. On the other hand, if the quotation is not drawn directly from the original source, other authors may be involved, which includes more than one intertextual link.<sup>44</sup>

We accordingly have to be very careful when trying to define the sources of Byzantine texts. We cannot search only the ancient texts, but also later and contemporary sources need to be investigated. Furthermore, both the context of the original passage and that of the quotation need to be studied, in order to understand the function of the quotation and the relation between the source and the imitation.<sup>45</sup> This is, of course, relevant for all quotations, not only those in Byzantine literature.

First of all we may note that Makrembolites never quotes Tatius, which one perhaps would have expected from such a carefully composed hypertext. The only exception is not really a quotation, but rather an expression that is

---

<sup>40</sup> *H&H* 2.7.2 (cf. *Aj.* 554b); 2.14.6 (*Aj.* 132–133); 3.9.1 (cf. *Aj.* 507–508); 5.10.3 (*Aj.* 293); 7.5.2 (*Aj.* 811); 9.23.2 (*El.* 59–60). See also the possible allusion to the *Antigone* in *H&H* 10.12.2 (cf. *Ant.* 944–954).

<sup>41</sup> *H&H* 6.14.7 (*Prom.* 79–80). See also the possible allusion in *H&H* 5.3.4 (cf. *Eumen.* 567–568). The Tyrrhenian trumpet is common in tragedy; see also Sophocles' *Aias* 17, Euripides' *Rhesus* 988–999, and *Heraclidae* 830–831; Conca (1994a) 564–665, n. 3. The *Aias*, due to its status as a school play and the frequent use of it in *H&H*, is, however, the most probable source.

<sup>42</sup> *H&H* 7.4.2 (*Pl.* 600); 11.19.4 (*Nu.* 1–2).

<sup>43</sup> Aeschylus: *Prometheus*, *Persae*, *Septem*; Euripides: *Orestes*, *Hecuba*, *Phoenissae*; Sophocles: *Aias*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*. For the respective manuscript traditions, see Turyn (1943, 1952, 1957).

<sup>44</sup> For example, a supposed quotation from Euripides' *Hippolytus* in *H&H* 4.15.1, also found in one of Psellos' letters, may be drawn from Plutarch's *Moralia*; Agapitos (2000b) 7–9. See also above, pp. 104, 132–134 on Aristotle, Gregory of Nazianzos, Synesios, Theophylact, and Makrembolites.

<sup>45</sup> Yet another problem concerns the authenticity of the quotations: whether they actually originate from the author of the novel or from some later scribe or scholar. It is possible that some of the quotations were originally conscious or unconscious allusions that were "corrected", i.e. made into a quotation, by a scribe or an editor at a later stage.

drawn from *L&K*. In *L&K* there is a discussion on the origin of wine, and a number of different kinds of wine are enumerated:

οἶνον οὐκ εἶναι ποτε παρ' ἀνθρώποις ὅπου μήπω παρ' αὐτοῖς, οὐ τὸν μέλανα τὸν ἀνθοσμῖαν, οὐ τὸν τῆς βιβλίας ἀμπέλου, οὐ τὸν Μάρωνος τὸν Θράκιον, οὐ Χῖον ἐκ Λακαίνης, οὐ τὸν Ἰκάρου τὸν νησιώτην. (*L&K* 2.2.2)

No wine ever existed among men before the Tyrians had it—not ‘the *noir* of fine bouquet’, not ‘the wine of *biblia*’, not ‘the Thracian vintage of Maron’, not ‘the Chian from a Lakonian [cup]’, not ‘the island wine of Ikaros’.

These are all wines from famous passages of literature, and the “Chian wine from a Lakonian cup” has been identified as a quotation from Aristophanes.<sup>46</sup> The expression occurs in *H&H* in Hysminias’ description of the fountain in Sosthenes’ garden:

τὸν τοῦ φρέατος πυθμένα νησιώτης ἐκόσμει λίθος λευκὸς [...] τὰ κύκλωθεν ἐκόσμει τοῦ φρέατος λίθος Χῖος ὁ ἐκ Λακαίνης, καὶ Θετταλὸς ἐτέρωθεν, καὶ μέσον πολύχρους τις καὶ οἶον ἑκατοντάχρους [...]. (*H&H* 1.5.7)

Island marble decorated the base of the well, [...]; the well’s surround was decorated with marble from Chios, similar to Lakonian marble,<sup>47</sup> and on the other side with Thessalian marble and the central section had multi-coloured marble of a hundred hues [...].

The characteristic expression and its position in the beginning of the novel functions as a signal to the reader, indicating *L&K* as the hypotext. The significance lies not only in the expression itself, but also in the context. The expressions are indeed used in different ways, referring to different objects, but both are included in lists of different kinds (of wine and marble respectively), and both lists share yet another category: the island wine and the island marble.<sup>48</sup> Makrembolites’ chapter is then concluded with an expression that occurs in and may be drawn from *L&K*: καὶ ἦν θέαμα καινόν, “this was a novel sight” (*H&H* 1.5.8).<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Aristophanes, fr. 216; see Vilborg (1962) 38–39 on the other quotations and textual problems related to the passage.

<sup>47</sup> I understand the meaning of these words as if the text read ὡς ἐκ Λακαίνης, since the literal “coming from Lakonia” or “coming from Lakonian [stone?]” make no sense; cf. Schissel (1942) 26–27 and Plepelits (1989) 179, n. 4. The expression is included as a hypertextual signal, and not as an explanation of the true nature of the stone, which may explain the oddity of the passage.

<sup>48</sup> *L&K*: τὸν Ἰκάρου τὸν νησιώτην, “island wine of Ikaros”; *H&H*: νησιώτης... λίθος, “island marble”; Plepelits (1989) 179, n. 4.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *L&K* 2.14.4: καὶ γίνεταί τὸ θέαμα καινόν; 4.12.1: καὶ ἔστι τὸ θέαμα καινόν; 4.4.7: εἶδον δέ ποτε θέαμα καινόν; Plepelits, *ibid*.



Ancient literature occurs in *H&H* either as *verbatim* or adapted quotations. Since Byzantine authors usually quoted from memory, the adapted quotations should not be seen as mistakes on the part of the author, but as part of the imitative technique.<sup>50</sup> An important difference on a textual level is that the *verbatim* quotations stand out, while the adapted ones are more closely integrated into the author's own discourse. One example may be found in *H&H* 3.3.3: ἐρᾷς· οὐ μόνος, ἀλλὰ σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν, "you are in love, you are not alone in this but share the experience with many mortals." This is an adapted line from Euripides' *Hippolytus*, which in the original runs ἐρᾷς — τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; — σὺν πολλοῖς βρωτῶν.<sup>51</sup> Since the quotation here is inserted in the middle of a dialogue, a metric verse would not blend with the surrounding discourse in the same way. Imitation is a matter of integrating a living heritage, not necessarily static formulas, into one's own text.<sup>52</sup>

Metrically rendered quotations are in *H&H* often placed by the end of a chapter, so as not to interrupt the narrative flow, like these two verses from Hesiod's *Erga* (719–720):

καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐλοιδορεῖ γλῶσσαν 'γλώσσης τοι' λέγων 'θησαυρὸς ἐν ἀνθρώ-  
ποισιν ἄριστος  
φειδωλῆς, πλείστη δὲ χάρις κατὰ μέτρον ἰούσης.' (*H&H* 1.13.3)

and he began to reproach me for chattering too much, saying, 'A niggardly tongue  
is men's best treasure and greatest benefits are due to its moderate use.'

<sup>50</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 29. Ancient authors did the same thing; cf. above, p. 261, n. 3, and below, n. 52.

<sup>51</sup> Euripides, *Hipp.* 439. Cf. Agapitos (2000b) 8, who doubts that the *Hippolytus* was read by the learned audience in the 11th and 12th centuries, and shows how a "quotation" in *H&H* 4.15.1 probably derives from Plutarch's *Moralia* via Psellos, rather than from the tragedy itself. I very much agree with the idea of deceptive *Quellenforschung*, but I am not convinced that the *Hippolytus* was not read by the Byzantines (Turyn [1957] 19, to which Agapitos refers, does not convince me either). Firstly, a 14th-century MS presupposes an older MS to copy (cf. above, p. 174 on the Laurentianus). Secondly, quotations in *gnomologia* or *florilegia* were not transmitted anonymously (see above, p. 266). A combination of quotations and/or allusions (as described above, p. 266) indeed does not prove the reading of a particular text, but it does indicate a knowledge of the story expressed in the text. I believe that Makrembolites, even if he had not read the entire *Hippolytus*, was familiar with the myth of Phaidra and Hippolytos, and associated it with the Euripidean quotations that he inserted in *H&H*. On Euripides in Byzantine *gnomologia*, see Meschini (1973/74).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. e.g. Plato's criticism and discussion of Simonides' poem in the *Protagoras* 339a–342a. It could be argued, in such a case as *H&H* 3.3.3, that we are dealing with allusion rather than quotation. My own division of allusions and quotations into two categories is based on the number of words repeated by Makrembolites, but it is indeed sometimes hard to draw a line between allusion and adapted quotation.

In the same chapter, there is an adapted quotation, not rendered in metre and placed in mid-paragraph: οὐ γὰρ παννύχιον εὐδῆναι ἄνδρα κήρυκα, “a herald should not sleep all night long” (*H&H* 1.13.1). It reflects a Homeric verse<sup>53</sup> which is one of the most popular Homeric quotations in Byzantine literature.<sup>54</sup>

Most of the quotations in *H&H* are not introduced by any marker to define them as quotations. This is how the Byzantines usually quote: names of the authors are either left out or given in encoded form: “the poet”, for example, always refers to Homer, which is in itself, of course, part of the imitation or continuation of the ancient practice. There are nine cases in *H&H* in which a marker accompanies the quotation; all these quotations are drawn from Hesiod and Euripides.<sup>55</sup> Hesiod is the only author who is also mentioned by name;<sup>56</sup> other markers are in the form of “according to the poet”, “as the wise man said”, and the like. We may also note here the more subtle allusion to literary tradition in *H&H* 1.4.3: “I felt that I could not take as fiction the Elysian plain so solemnly described by poets.”<sup>57</sup> A marker such as “in the words of the poet”, or “according to the tragedy”, underlines a quotation and emphasises its authoritative nature.

In two cases is a quotation repeated, but never in exactly the same manner. A quotation from Hesiod appears in two different versions in *H&H*; the original runs as follows: ἴς ἀνέμου βορέω· τροχαλὸν δὲ γέροντα τίθησιν. | καὶ διὰ παρθενικῆς ἀπαλόχροος οὐ διάησιν, “the wind Boreas; but it makes the old man run quick.”<sup>58</sup> And it does not blow through the tender maiden.”<sup>59</sup> In *H&H* 2.4.5, the second verse (*Erga* 519) is adapted with the addition of the Homeric epithet αἰθρηγενέτης: διὰ γάρ τοι παρθενικῆς

<sup>53</sup> *Il.* 2.24: οὐ γὰρ παννύχιον εὐδῆναι βουλευφόρον ἄνδρα, “a man that is a counsellor should not sleep all night long.”

<sup>54</sup> There were certain quotations, especially from Homer, that enjoyed a special popularity among Byzantine authors; Hunger (1969/70) 29–30 gives four examples, three of which are used by Makrembolites (*Il.* 3.157, *Il.* 2.24 = *Il.* 2.61, and *Il.* 22.126 = *Od.* 19.163).

<sup>55</sup> Three refer to Hesiod and his *Erga* (*H&H* 4.2.3, 4.9.2, 4.18.10), three to Euripides’ *Medea* (*H&H* 3.9.6, 8.20.3, 9.23.1), two to Euripides’ *Hecuba* (*H&H* 6.13.2, 7.13.1), and one to Euripides’ *Hippolytus* (*H&H* 10.6.5).

<sup>56</sup> *H&H* 4.9.2: ἐπικάλυμμα φέρει τῇ κεφαλῇ πῖλον ἀσκητὸν καθ’ Ἡσίοδον, “he had a cap on his head, a close-fitting cap, in Hesiod’s words”; cf. Hesiod, *Erga* 545–546.

<sup>57</sup> See above, pp. 263–264.

<sup>58</sup> Another interpretation of τροχαλόν is “curved like a wheel”, but see the commentary of West (1978) 287: “the normally slow-moving old man is seen bowling along as easily as a wheel as he scampers to shelter; or perhaps the idea is that the wind drives him along like a boy driving a hoop.”

<sup>59</sup> Hesiod, *Erga* 518–519.



ἀπαλόχροος οὐ διάησιν αἰθρηγενέτης βορρᾶς, “but the north wind, the scion of clear skies, does not pierce the tender-skinned girl.” In *H&H* 4.18.13 the same quotation appears in a different version: ὁ γάρ τοι χειμῶν διὰ κόρης ἀπαλόχροος οὐ διάησι, τροχαλὸν δὲ γέροντα τίθησιν, “for winter does not pierce a tender-skinned girl, but makes the old man run quick.” Here the quotation has been expanded so as to contain two verses, but in a reversed order. This longer quotation functions as a marker: it closes the extensive ekphrasis of the twelve months, in which Hesiod is emphasised as an authority.<sup>60</sup>

The other repeated quotation is a Homeric verse from the *Iliad*: νύξ δ’ ἦδη τελέθει· ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι, “night-time advances apace: ’tis good to pay heed to the night-time.”<sup>61</sup> The second half of the verse occurs first in *H&H* 2.13.3 (ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι) and then the complete verse appears in *H&H* 4.19.2. Kratisthenes, who is speaking the second time, in fact quotes Sosthenes, who uttered the quotation the first time. The quotation both times marks the end of a chapter, the end of a symposium and the end of a day.<sup>62</sup>

In both cases the second repeated quotation has a clear function on a narrative level, as a marker of the closure of a passage. In both cases the second quotation is also the longer and more “correct” version. It thus seems to comment upon, or explain, the first occurrence; it may be seen as a “second chance” for the reader, in case he did not recognise it the first time. Such repetitions of quotations are cases of intertextual amplification, in line with the overall repetitive scheme.<sup>63</sup> And we should note that the Homeric verse discussed here is in the model too a case of repetition; in the *Iliad* it recurs only ten lines after the first occurrence.<sup>64</sup>

Quotations may function in the narrative as commentary, for example in *H&H* 1.10.1, the parenthetically inserted ὁ καὶ παράδοξόν μοι δοκεῖ, θυμοῦ τικτόμενον ἔρευθος, “which struck me as paradoxical, blushing en-

<sup>60</sup> On Hesiod, see also below, p. 277.

<sup>61</sup> *Il.* 7.282, 7.293.

<sup>62</sup> The quotation is used in the same manner by Plutarch in the end of *Septem sapientium convivium* 164d: Ὑπολαβὼν δ’ ὁ Σόλων ‘οὐκοῦν’ ἔφη, ‘καὶ τῷ σοφωτάτῳ πιστευτέον Ὀμήρῳ νύξ δ’ ἦδη τελέθει· ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι, “Solon here put in his word: ‘Well, then, we should have faith in the very great wisdom of Homer who always says, *Night-time advances* etc.”

<sup>63</sup> On repetition and quotation, and repetition of quotations, see Savran (1988).

<sup>64</sup> See above, p. 272, n. 61.

gendered by rage”, a modified quotation from Kallistratos’ *Imagines*.<sup>65</sup> Quotations occur, however, most often in speech—not only in the voice of the narrator Hysminias, but also in other characters’ monologues or dialogues. Kratisthenes is a character who expresses himself to a large degree in quotations. By the end of book 1, he wakes Hysminias up with the adapted Homeric verse already discussed above: “a herald should not sleep all night.”<sup>66</sup> In the same chapter, Kratisthenes utters the novel’s first *verbatim* quotation, also discussed above: “a niggardly tongue is men’s best treasure and greatest benefits are due to its moderate use.”<sup>67</sup> He also closes the following chapter with yet another adapted quotation: φύσις ζώων ἀδίδακτοι, “animal nature cannot be taught” (*H&H* 1.14.5).<sup>68</sup> We should note that at the same time there is an allusion to *L&K* 1.10.1 in this quotation.<sup>69</sup> Kratisthenes continues to express himself in a number of quotations and proverbs, which adds a special flavour to his character: as the helper and the more experienced of the two young men, he is also the more educated and intertextually sophisticated; he borrows his authority from the *auctores*.

In contrast to Kratisthenes, the experiencing Hysminias does not from the beginning express himself in quotations. That is, however, not the case with Hysminias the narrator, who immediately inserts classical references in the narration. The first quotation by the experiencing Hysminias appears by the end of book 2: τοὺς γὰρ σώφρονας θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς, “for the gods love the chaste and hate evil men” (*H&H* 2.14.6). The one and a half verses derive from one of the Sophoclean school plays;<sup>70</sup> this is accordingly a quotation that even a young boy would be able to use. Hysminias does, however, make a mistake in choosing to quote this particular verse, since he is dealing with a god who does not love the chaste.<sup>71</sup> We may also note Kratisthenes’ reaction to Hysminias’ comment upon the description of Phronesis (Prudence) in book 2. As Hysminias sees the glowing gems of her crown, he cries out χάλαζα καὶ ἄνθρακες πυρός, “hails and coals of fire”. Kratisthenes laughs at him, ἀνεκάγχασέ μου τῇ παραχρήσει τοῦ ῥήματος, “burst out laughing at my misuse of the expression” (*H&H*

<sup>65</sup> Kallistratos, *Imagines* 11.2: ὁ δὲ καὶ παράδοξον ἦν, χαλκοῦ τικτόμενον ἔρευθος, “a thing incredible, a ruddiness born of the bronze”.

<sup>66</sup> *H&H* 1.13.1; cf. *Il.* 2.24; see above, p. 271.

<sup>67</sup> *H&H* 1.13.3; cf. Hesiod, *Erga* 719–720; see above, p. 270.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Hippocrates, *De Alimentis* 39; see above, pp. 123–124, 148, 257.

<sup>69</sup> See above, p. 257.

<sup>70</sup> Sophocles, *Aj.* 132–133: [...] τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας | θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς.

<sup>71</sup> In Sophocles, the meaning of σώφρων is not “chaste”, but “soberminded” or “prudent”; Plepelits (1989) 183, n. 29; Conca (1994a) 526, n. 26.



2.2.3). The expression is a *verbatim* quotation from the *Psalms*, where it refers to a divine epiphany.<sup>72</sup> It is hard to know exactly what Kratisthenes means: does Hysminias misuse a Biblical reference in a non-Biblical context, or does he misuse the maxim in relation to the actual nature of the painting?<sup>73</sup> The most likely explanation is, in my view, that Hysminias misunderstands the painting and interprets it according to a spiritual, Christian context.<sup>74</sup> In either case, Kratisthenes mocks Hysminias' use of the quotation, which brings to the fore the contrast between the inexperienced Hysminias and the educated Kratisthenes. The use of quotation is a marker of experience and maturity: Hysminias' limited use of quotation in the beginning of the book should thus be considered in relation to his misinterpretations of paintings, as part of his characterisation as young and inexperienced; Kratisthenes' liberal use of ancient literature and his role as interpreter of the paintings emphasises the difference between the two.

There are also other characters who express themselves in ancient quotations. Most interesting are perhaps the dialogues, for example the ironic dialogue between Hysmine and Hysminias in *H&H* 9.23.<sup>75</sup> A similar situation occurs in the dialogue between Panthia and Sosthenes in *H&H* 6.14.7, where the upset Panthia answers her husband with a quotation from Aeschylus' *Prometheus*.

<sup>72</sup> *Ps.* 17.13. See below, p. 280 on other references to the *Septuagint*. See also above, p. 254, n. 392 on allusions with manifold meanings.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Plepelits (1989) 180, n. 13; Conca (1994a) 514, n. 2. We may note that there is no opposition between the hails and coals in the Biblical context since both come from the sky, whereas in *H&H* there is a structural opposition in the preceding passage on fire and water/ice: λίθοι περὶ τὸν στέφανον μάλα τηλαυγείς, πῦρ ἀπαστράπτουτες καὶ φῶς ἀπαυγάζοντες, ὕδατων μεστοί. Εἴποισι ἰδὼν μεμίχθαι τὰ ἄμικτα, ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ, ἐν λίθῳ καὶ ἄμφω τερπνὰ καὶ ἄμφω χαρίεντα, "the gems round the crown gleamed brightly, flashing fire and giving off light, yet full of water. You might say that the immiscible, fire and water, was mingled in the gem and both were delightful and both were charming" (*H&H* 2.2.1–2). Cf. *L&K* 2.14.7: τὸ γοῦν τῆς Σικελικῆς πηγῆς ὕδωρ κεκερασμένον ἔχει πῦρ· καὶ φλόγα μὲν ὄψει κάτωθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἀλλομένην ἄνω· θιγόντι δέ σοι τὸ ὕδωρ ψυχρόν· ἐστὶν οἷον περ χιών, καὶ οὔτε τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος κατασβέννυται οὔτε τὸ ὕδωρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς φλέγεται, ἀλλ' ὕδατός εἰσιν ἐν τῇ κρήνῃ καὶ πυρὸς σπονδαί, "in Sicily there is a spring whose water is shot through with fire. You can see the flames flickering upwards from the depths. If you touch the water, it is cold as snow. Neither the fire is quenched by the water nor the water burned by the fire, but they fraternize in the fountain under conditions of truce."

<sup>74</sup> See also above, pp. 104, 111, 130–134 on Hysminias' misinterpretation of Eros as emperor/Christ and the similarity in representation between the virtues and Church paintings.

<sup>75</sup> Discussed above, pp. 148–149.

Καὶ ὁ Σωσθένης ‘μὴ τὴν γλῶσσαν οὕτω προπετῶς προπέμποις καὶ ἀναιδῶς, μὴ σοι Ζεὺς χολωθῇ. Πεισθῶμεν τῷ Θεμιστεῖ.’ Καὶ πρὸς τὸν Σωσθένην ἡ Πανθία φησί

‘σὺ μαλθακίζου, τὴν δ’ ἐμὴν αὐθαδίαν  
ὀργῆς τε τραχύτητα μὴ ἐπίπλησσε μοι·  
ὅλα γὰρ τὰ σπλάγχνα μου καταπίμπραμαι.’ (H&H 6.14.7)

And Sosthenes said, ‘Do not let your tongue run so precipitously and shamelessly in case Zeus is enraged. Let us obey Themisteus.’ And Panthia said to Sosthenes, ‘You play the woman if you wish, but cast not in my teeth my stubborn will and my relentless mood, for my entrails are on fire.’

Panthia’s line is in the original context that of Kratos (strength), who rebukes Hephaistos for not being severe enough when riveting Prometheus to the cliff.<sup>76</sup> If the criminal is not properly shackled, Zeus’ wrath may befall the “jailers”.<sup>77</sup> That same risk is exactly what Sosthenes warns Panthia of, and to which she responds so vigorously. There is thus a connection between the original context of the quotation and the use that Makrembolites makes of it. We may note that the *Prometheus* was a school-play and, as such, probably well known to the author and his audience.<sup>78</sup>

In the following chapter, Hysminias’ father Themisteus speaks to Panthia and quotes tragedy in order to comment upon the nature of women.

ὥς μήτηρ μὲν σύ, καὶ μήτηρ φιλόπαις, οὐχ ἦττον δὲ καὶ καλλίπαις (εἰρήσθω γὰρ τὰ ληθές), οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι· ὥς δὲ καὶ “γυναιξὶ δεινόν” κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν  
“αἱ δι’ ὠδίνων γοναί,” ὅλαι μητέρες συμμαρτυρήσουσιν· 3 ὅτι δ’  
ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφν,  
οἶδας πάντες καὶ σύ. (H&H 6.15.2–3)

That you are a mother, a mother who loves her child and no less a mother of a beautiful child (for let the truth be spoken) I will not deny. But that *mighty with women*, according to the tragedy, *is their travail’s fruit*, all mothers would agree; 3 and, moreover, that *plain and unvarnished is the tale of truth* everybody knows, including you.

Both quotations derive from Euripides’ *Phoinissae*; the first is slightly altered,<sup>79</sup> the second a *verbatim* quotation.<sup>80</sup> A central issue in the *Phoinissae* is the position of Jokasta as the potential mediator between her two sons Eteokles and Polyneikes, and accordingly the trouble and sorrow that women go through because of and for the sake of their children. The situa-

<sup>76</sup> Aeschylus, *Prom.* 79–80.

<sup>77</sup> See *Prom.* 76–77, cf. 61–62, 67–68.

<sup>78</sup> On the “Byzantine triad”, see above, p. 268, n. 43.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Phoen.* 355: δεινὸν γυναιξὶν αἱ δι’ ὠδίνων γοναί.

<sup>80</sup> Euripides, *Phoen.* 469.



tion of Panthia is not as tragic as that of Jokasta, but she herself is very upset and Themisteus' choice of words is intended to show her that he understands how she feels; he wishes to avoid the reaction that Sosthenes just provoked.

Quotations render a certain authority to the speaker: Kratisthenes is portrayed as the wise and educated friend; the calm and sober Themisteus manages to calm down the almost hysterical Panthia. In all these cases the original context of the quotation proves to be significant; if not always the specific passage, then certainly the central themes of the drama.

Quotation may also interact with allusion in the novel. One example may be seen in the episode in which the bad omen is discussed, and Panthia expresses her refusal to return to the altar.

Ἡ δὲ Πανθία φησὶν 'οὐκέτι περὶ τὸν βωμὸν γένωμαι, οὐ θῦμα θύσω λαμπρὸν ὑψιπέτη ἀετῶ· ὅς ἄλλος μοι τῶν θυμάτων, ἄλλος μοι τῶν θρηγνῶν, κόρος μοι τῆς ἀπευκαταίας ταύτης οἰωνοσκοπῆς· κἄν ὁ θηριώδης ἐκεῖνος ἀετὸς καὶ ἀπαίσιος οὐκ ἐκορέσθη τοῖς θύμασιν, οὗτος ἀετὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὃς Προμηθέως ὀρύττει πλευράν, ὃς ὅλον ἦπαρ κατέφαγε καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ὅλην ταύτην γαστέρα παντελῶς κατορώρυχε καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα κατεδηδόκει μου.' (H&H 6.14.5–6)

Panthia said, 'I cannot go to the altar again, I shall make no sacrifice for the high-soaring eagle; 6 I have had enough of sacrifices, enough of laments, I have had a surfeit of this abominable taking of auguries. Even if that terrifying and ill-omened eagle is not sated with sacrifices, it is clearly the eagle that gouged out Prometheus' side and fed on his entire liver and now has utterly gouged out my own belly and has devoured my entrails.'

In the next chapter follows the quotation from Aeschylus' *Prometheus* that was discussed just above.<sup>81</sup> In the following chapter appears a reference to Epimetheus, Prometheus' brother:

εἰ μὲν γὰρ μετὰ τὸν νυμφῶνα τὸ θῦμα, καὶ Ζεὺς ἀνανεύει τοὺς γάμους καὶ τῷ ἀετῷ τὴν ἀνανεύσιν ὑπαινίττεται, οὐκ ἄκαιρόν σοι τὸ δάκρυον· τῷ γάρ τοι Ἐπιμηθεὶ τὸ μεταμέλειν ἀνωφελῶς ἀφωσίσωται· (H&H 6.15.4)

For if the sacrifice took place after the ceremony and Zeus disapproved of the marriage and hinted at his disapproval through the eagle, your tears would not be untimely; for it was to Epimetheus that useless repentance was granted.

The myth of Epimetheus is related in Hesiod's *Erga* 83–89, and was thus familiar to educated Byzantines, along with Aeschylus' *Prometheus*, which, as already mentioned, was a school text. The sufferings of Prometheus are explicitly displayed in the drama, and in fact also described in detail in

<sup>81</sup> H&H 6.14.7; Aeschylus, *Prom.* 79–80. See above, pp. 274–275.

*L&K*.<sup>82</sup> Epimetheus and Prometheus are by their nature opposites, and their juxtaposition in this passage should be considered in relation to other oppositions and paradoxes in *H&H*. In a passage like this, allusion and quotation interact, creating a more explicit reference to the intertext; in this particular case, there also seem to be double allusions to both Aeschylus and Tattius.

The use of allusion and quotation may accumulate to create dramatic or tragic atmosphere in a passage. We have already seen examples of this in the storm passage and in Hysminias' dream sequence of Panthia catching him and Hysmine *in flagrante*.<sup>83</sup> In book 4, there are a number of quotations and allusions to Hesiod that together emphasise the year/time motif expressed in the ekphrasis of the twelve months; Hesiod, as the author of the *Erga*, is an authority on the subject. There are five quotations from or references to *Erga* in book 4. In three cases they are introduced as such;<sup>84</sup> the two other are "silent" references.<sup>85</sup> These quotations from and allusions to Hesiod, and particularly the explicit references to him and his poetry, underline the authority of the thoughts expressed here on the theme of time.<sup>86</sup>

There is a difference between the use of authors like Hesiod, who would be immediately recognised as an authority, and quotations less strictly bound to a specific source. Expressions whose ultimate source we are now able to identify with the tools that are available to us (indexes, lexica, the *TLG* etc.), were often used by the Byzantines just as more or less anonymous maxims or proverbs. An example occurs in book 7 and is then repeated in book 8: *καπνὸν φεύγοντες εἰς πῦρ ἐμπεπτώκαμεν*, "running away from

<sup>82</sup> *L&K* 3.8, cf. 2.21; Epimetheus is never mentioned in *L&K*.

<sup>83</sup> See above, pp. 213–219, 224–227; the latter passage will also be investigated in further detail below, pp. 283–286.

<sup>84</sup> *H&H* 4.2.3: *κατὰ τὴν ποίησιν*; 4.9.2: *καθ' Ἡσίοδον*; 4.18.10: *ὃν καὶ τις σοφὸς [...] ἠκριβώσατο*.

<sup>85</sup> *H&H* 4.18.13. We may note that the allusions are not always used in accordance with the original context. For example in *H&H* 4.9.2, the man that represents the month July wears a *πίλον*, a cap, to protect himself against the heat; in *Erga* 545–546, this cap is worn in the winter. Likewise, in *H&H* 4.18.13 the expression *τῇ ἐστίῃ ἐμπελαδόν* refers to an old man warming himself in front of the hearth, whereas Hesiod, *Erga* 734, gives a set of rules on how not to behave in front of the hearth. The second reference in 4.18.13 is the repeated quotation of *H&H* 2.4.5, already discussed above, pp. 271–272. These "blind" uses may be a result of the frequent use of the school material and the quotation from memory; if expressions are used often they tend to lose the connection to their original context.

<sup>86</sup> Hesiod was commented upon and discussed in the 12th century, when John Tzetzes wrote a commentary on the *Erga* ca. 1135–1140, probably based on a series of lectures held in Constantinople; see West (1978) 69–70, 73–74.



the smoke, we have fallen into the fire" (*H&H* 7.9.6).<sup>87</sup> The expression can be traced back to Plato,<sup>88</sup> but it is a figure of speech rather than a quotation,<sup>89</sup> and should most probably not be read as a reference to Plato.<sup>90</sup>

Other sayings are explicitly presented as maxims or proverbs, as in *H&H* 6.10.6 κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἄνθρακας εὕρισκω τοὺς θησαυρούς, "as the proverb has it, I have found that my treasure is coal."<sup>91</sup> Similar presentations occur of maxims that can in fact be traced back to a specific author. For example, Hysminias uses the famous quotation from Plutarch ἢ τὰν ἢ ἐπὶ τάν, "with the shield or on it",<sup>92</sup> but it is followed by κατὰ Λάκαιναν ἐν ἀσπίδι γνωματευομένου, "I uttered like the Spartan mother [about the shield]" (*H&H* 7.14.1). The expression was a proverb already in Plutarch's days, and it occurs as such both in the *Suda* and in other sources.<sup>93</sup> Very famous quotations, such as the most common Homeric verses, may have been used in a similar way as figures of speech, for example the popular οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός, οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης, "for they were not made of oak or rock" (*H&H* 6.11.2).<sup>94</sup>

Our search for classical allusions and quotations should accordingly not make us forget the text itself, and its relationship to its hypo-, inter- and metatexts.<sup>95</sup> If we do, *Quellenforschung* may result in a feeble attempt to

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *H&H* 8.13.3: εἰς πῦρ ἐκ καπνῶν ἐμπεσόντες καὶ ὄμβρων εἰς θάλασσαν, "leaping from the smoke into the flame and from the storm into the sea."

<sup>88</sup> Plato, *Rep.* 8.569b–c: ὁ δῆμος φεύγων ἂν καπνὸν δουλείας ἐλευθέρων εἰς πῦρ δούλων δεσποτείας ἂν ἐμπεπτωκώς εἴη.

<sup>89</sup> See *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, vol. 1, p. 314 (Diogenianus VIII.45); vol. 2, p. 220 (Macarius VII.42) and p. 474 (Apostolius IX.59a).

<sup>90</sup> Cf also *H&H* 8.21.3: τύχη τὰ θνητῶν πράγματα, οὐκ εὐβολία, "fate, and not wise counsel, rules men's affairs"; cf. the Chairemon fragment, fr. 2 i *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 1, p. 217.

<sup>91</sup> Lucian, *Zeuxis* 2; *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, vol. 1, p. 32 (Zenobius II.1) and p. 195 (Diogenianus I.90).

<sup>92</sup> I.e. "victory or death."

<sup>93</sup> Plutarch, *Lacaenarum apophthegmata* 241.16; *Suda*, H 616; in *Corpus paroemiographorum*, vol. 2, p. 450 (Apostolius VIII. 71).

<sup>94</sup> *Od.* 19.163, cf. *Il.* 22.126. Hunger (1969/70) 29–30; see above, p. 271 and n. 54.

<sup>95</sup> See e.g. the, in my view, dubious interpretation of *H&H* 6.3.2, μήτερ, ἀλγέω τὴν κεφαλὴν, "mother, I have a headache", as a combination of Sappho's γλύκη μάτερ (fr.102) and Theocritus' ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν (*Id.* 3.52). See Gigante (1960) 175; Alexiou (1977) 37. The situation is not extreme: a young girl needs an excuse to leave the table and asks her mother's permission; no specific allusion needs to be sought. It may be that there is some allusion to Theocritus here (cf. the other allusions and quotations discussed above, p. 266), but probably not to Sappho. On Sappho in Byzantium, see Garzya (1971) and, briefly, Agapitos (1989b) 64, n. 37.

“justify” a Byzantine text by its classical quotations in order to give it a higher status—or even to justify the scholar’s own interest in the text.

### 3.3 Allusion to the Christian tradition

There are in *H&H* a number of passages which can be interpreted as allusions to the Christian tradition, references to the *Septuagint* and to the *New Testament*.<sup>96</sup> Plepelits has even argued that the whole novel is a Christian allegory, in which Hysmine is a symbol of the Church and Hysminias represents man on his road to spiritual enlightenment.<sup>97</sup> We have already seen one example of a Biblical quotation in the description of Phronesis in book 2, the “hails and coals of fire” that Hysminias cries out in response to the painting.<sup>98</sup> In the same paragraph there is an expression reminiscent of the *Song of Songs*: ὀρμίσκος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἐξ ἀργυρίου μετὰ στιγμάτων χρυσοῦ, “a necklet of silver with flecks of gold was around the maiden’s neck.”<sup>99</sup>

There are a number of other passages and expressions which may be seen as allusions to the *Song*, in particular the garden and love imagery by which Hysmine is described as a garden or as a honeycomb.<sup>100</sup> We must, however, remember that the garden, the association of the garden with the heroine and the description of women in vegetal imagery, are central motifs also in the ancient novel and in Hellenistic love poetry, e.g. in the *Greek Anthology*.<sup>101</sup> If we study the imagery of the beloved’s mouth as a beehive filled with honey, which occurs in the *Song of Songs* 4.11, it appears several times in *H&H*, but one of the passages contains an allusion also to *L&K*.

μέμυκέ σου τὸ στόμα, τὸ σίμβλον τοῦ μέλιτος, τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν τοῦτο στόμα πλα-  
τυνθὲν ἐξ ὀδύνης κατατραγωδεῖ σοι τὸν ἐξιτήριοι καὶ ὥς ἐκ κέντρον σῆς  
μελίσσης πληγὲν φλεγμαίνει τοῖς πάθεσι. (*H&H* 7.17.11)

<sup>96</sup> See Poljakova (1979) 105, 110–113 on the *Septuagint* and 114 on the *New Testament*. On Christian aspects in the Komnenian novels, see also MacAlister (1996) esp. 133–135, 139, 162–164; Beaton (1996<sup>2</sup>) 56–57; Burton (1998).

<sup>97</sup> Plepelits (1989) esp. 29–69. See above, p. 17, n. 36.

<sup>98</sup> See above, pp. 273–274.

<sup>99</sup> *H&H* 2.2.4; cf. *Cant.* 1.11: ὁμοιώματα χρυσοῦ ποιήσομέν σοι μετὰ στιγμάτων τοῦ ἀργυρίου. Psellos wrote a commentary on the *Song*: *In Canticum*, poem 2 in Westerink (1992) 13–67. Psellos’ verses are a paraphrase of a commentary by Gregory of Nyssa; Westerink, *ibid.*, 13. Cf. below, p. 282, n. 114.

<sup>100</sup> See Poljakova (1979) 113; Littlewood (1979) 104–107; Burton (1998) 213. On different readings of the *Song*, see Burton (1998) 203.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. e.g. the garden imagery in *Cant.* 4.12 with the novelistic motifs as described above, pp. 97–103, 209–213.



Your mouth, that hive of honey, has grown dumb while my mouth, stretched with pain, sings for you the ode of farewell and swells with anguish as if pierced by your bee's sting.

The sting refers to *L&K* 2.7.4–7, where Kleitophon pretends to be stung by a bee in order to get a kiss from Leukippe.<sup>102</sup> The imagery of the beehive as a Christian allusion is thus here interacting with the reference to Tatius. This is, in my view, characteristic of all the Biblical allusions in *H&H*; even if the Christian themes played a crucial role in Byzantium, the links to the ancient heritage were strong, and one interpretation did not necessarily exclude another.<sup>103</sup>

Practically all the passages that may be read as Biblical allusions are also part of the ancient novel tradition. For example, Hysmine defending herself against erotic advances has been read as a reference to *Isaiah* 1.8.<sup>104</sup>

καὶ χερσὶ καὶ τραχήλῳ καὶ πώγωνι καὶ γαστρὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς καταφράττει καὶ περιφράττει· καὶ κάτωθεν μὲν ἀνέχει τὰ γόνατα, ὡς ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀκροβολίζει τὸ δάκρυον [...] (*H&H* 3.7.4)

and she fortified and barricaded her breasts with her hands and neck and fists and belly; and further down she raised her knees as she shot off a tear from the citadel of her head [...].

Such imagery of siege and war is, however, common also in the ancient novel, particularly with the person in love being under siege.<sup>105</sup>

One passage that seems to have a Biblical episode as a model, and that has no counterpart in the ancient novel, is the footwashing scene in *H&H*

<sup>102</sup> The passage has been discussed above, p. 255, with the imagery of the beehive in *H&H* in n. 396.

<sup>103</sup> Poljakova (1979) esp. 103, 105 underlines the polysemantic character of the elements in the novel, and thus the opening for different interpretations. Cf. above, pp. 31–32 on allegorical interpretations of *H&H*.

<sup>104</sup> *Isaiah* 1.8: ἐγκαταλειφθήσεται ἡ θυγάτηρ Σιων ὡς σκηνὴ ἐν ἀμπελῶνι καὶ ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἐν σικυηράτῳ, ὡς πόλις πολιορκουμένη, “and the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city”; Poljakova (1979) 111, n. 14. Poljakova argues that references of this kind are of an ornamental character; more important are situations that are modelled upon Biblical episodes, such as the seduction of Hysminias as modelled upon the story of Joseph and Potiphar’s wife (*Gen.* 39). See also Burton (1998) 213–214. It should also be noted that biblical quotations may well have been used as maxims or proverbs without a specific connotation to the Bible, much as they are today; cf. above, pp. 277–278, on ancient quotations as sayings or figures of speech.

<sup>105</sup> See e.g. *L&K* 1.9.1, 1.11.3, 2.4.5, 2.5.1. In *H&H*, the imagery recurs in two other passages: *H&H* 3.2.4–6, where Eros and Zeus are at war over Hysminias, and also 5.14.5, then with sleep laying Hysminias’ eyes under siege. On other motifs with relations to both the ancient novel and Biblical episodes, see Poljakova (1979) 105, 111.

1.12, repeated in a new version in 9.15.<sup>106</sup> Hysmine washes Hysminias' feet and, while doing so, she tickles and kisses them. The scene can be interpreted as an allusion or analogy to the Christian footwashing theme in hagiography or in the *New Testament*, i.e. either Jesus having his feet washed by a woman or himself washing the disciples' feet.<sup>107</sup> We should, however, also remember the connection with the theme in the ancient tradition, of which the most famous example is to be found in Homer.<sup>108</sup> Burton also sees a resonance of the footwashing episode in the shaping of *H&H*: part of the meaning of the episode in *John* (13.3–20) is that Jesus takes a servant's role, as Hysminias does in the second part of *H&H*, starting at 8.11.<sup>109</sup>

In my view, there may well be allusions to both ancient and Christian themes in the same passage. We should also remember that the first footwashing scene in *H&H* (1.12) is an important component in the erotic development: this is one of the first stages in Hysminias' process of falling in love. It has also been suggested that the tickling which Hysminias feels<sup>110</sup> may be not only a consequence of Hysmine's action, but also a symbolic sign of Eros' presence.<sup>111</sup> There are also one or two probable references to *L&K* in the passage, which underlines its intertextual complexity.<sup>112</sup> Christian and novelistic elements are thus interacting also here.

It should be noted that the erotic imagery known from the novels could be used also in a Christian context. Symeon the New Theologian in his hymns describes the desire towards a union with God in erotic terms, similar to those that Makrembolites uses in *H&H*.<sup>113</sup> In the *Homilies* of Gregory of

<sup>106</sup> Poljakova (1979) 113; Burton (1998) 208–211. See above, p. 59.

<sup>107</sup> Poljakova (1979) 114; Burton (1998) 208–211. Poljakova gives no exact references; the passages referred to by Burton are *Luke* 7.36–50 and *John* 13.3–20.

<sup>108</sup> *Od.* 19.386–505. For further references to the ancient tradition, see Burton (1998) 209, nn. 72–74; cf. also *Digenes Akritas* (Grottaferrata version) 4.209. Poljakova too mentions the Homeric connection, (1979) 114, n. 15, and in the same note she suggests a possible Byzantine imperial practice.

<sup>109</sup> Burton (1998) 211.

<sup>110</sup> *H&H* 1.12.3: καὶ τέλος ἀμύττουσα τοῖς ὄνυξιν γαργαλίζει με, “eventually she scratched me with her fingernails and tickled me.”

<sup>111</sup> As the imagery of Anacreon (6. 5–7 West), reused by Eugenianos (*D&C* 3.142–143) may indicate; Conca (1994a) 510, n. 14.

<sup>112</sup> *H&H* 1.12.3 ἀμύττουσα, cf. *L&K* 2.22.2, and see also *L&K* 1.6.2 for a similar significance of δωματίον; Conca (1994a) 510, nn. 12–13.

<sup>113</sup> See e.g. Symeon's hymn 1, esp. 133–140; p. 50 in Kambylis (1976). Note also the use of συνοουσία in hymn 15; p. 107 in Kambylis, *ibid.* See also MacAlister (1996) 108. Symeon lived ca. 949–1022. Theophylact of Ochrid praised Symeon's poetry, so we know of at least one intellectual in the late 11th century reading his work; see poem 4 in Gautier (1980) 352–353.



Nyssa on the *Song of Songs*, erotic metaphors of a Platonic background are used, the same metaphors that occur in both *L&K* and *H&H*.<sup>114</sup> It is accordingly not hard to imagine parallel erotic *and* Christian interpretations of the novel. In the twelfth century, Christian and pagan elements could be mixed rather freely in literature,<sup>115</sup> and a mixture of pagan and Christian quotations was a popular pattern that can be traced back to Clement of Alexandria.<sup>116</sup>

In fact, the main point of the allusions may have been exactly the ambiguity and the play with reader-response and the horizon of expectations.<sup>117</sup> The paintings of the Virtues and Eros, and Hysminias' interpretations of them, may illustrate this idea. We have already discussed how the iconography of the Virtues is reminiscent of the church paintings' Archangels and Saints, and how Eros is presented as a combination of the Hellenistic *putto*, Christ and the emperor.<sup>118</sup> The Christian iconography here contributes to Hysminias' confusion and subsequent misinterpretation of the painting as a picture of good and evil: the Christian virtues and the profane nude youth. Hysminias interprets the painting according to the Byzantine horizon of expectation: he is inexperienced and does not immediately make the connection with the ancient heritage, and Kratisthenes is therefore needed as his "guide".<sup>119</sup>

For a Byzantine reader, double meanings and ambiguous transtextual links like these may well have been part of the game.<sup>120</sup> Even if the allusions may seem enigmatic to us, they should not always be seen as literary riddles, since they were most probably immediately recognised by the contempo-

<sup>114</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *Hom.* VII 218.17–219.1 (eye, soul and mirror) *L&K* 5.13.3–4, *H&H* 4.19.2; *Hom.* V 138.3–6 (arrow in heart) e.g. *L&K* 1.4.4, *H&H* 3.2.3–4; Cupane (2000) 43, n. 116. See also MacAlister (1996) 108. On erotic language in early Byzantine patristic and mystical literature, see Cameron (1997) esp. 7–17; on sexuality and erotics in the *New Testament*, see Wengst (1993).

<sup>115</sup> E.g. in the *Timarion*, or in Basilakes' ethopoeia on Hades and Lazarus, *progymn.* 39 in Pignani (1983) 163–166. On the *Christos Paschon*, in which pagan verses are used for a Christian purpose, see Hunger (1968) 62–65.

<sup>116</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 30 and n. 94, (1965) 342–343, and (1981) 46.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Dyck (1986) 85 on the idea of allegory as a means of defending novels against criticism, Beck (1977) on the fading genre of Saints' lives as an opening for the novel, and also Burton (1998) 182 on the revival as motivated by "a desire for a safe (distanced) forum for broaching sensitive theological subjects".

<sup>118</sup> See above, pp. 111, 203–208.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. above, pp. 273–274 on the contrast between Hysminias and Kratisthenes as the learned and the young boy.

<sup>120</sup> Hunger (1969/70) 29 and (1965) 343.

rary reader.<sup>121</sup> All kinds of transtextual references contribute to an overall “spatialising” effect: they widen the intertextual perspective and make the text more dense and complex. This is particularly true for *H&H* because the hypotext interacts and intertwines with the other intertextual layers. We will describe how this works by looking at one of the passages which plot- and motif-wise has a corresponding passage in *L&K* and yet includes clear allusions to other ancient literature.

### 3.4 Hypotext and architexts: Makrembolites, Tatiús, and other texts

We have already discussed the dream scene in which Panthia attacks Hysminias with an army of angry women, and the subversion of the motif from *L&K* that has taken place in *H&H*.<sup>122</sup> The hypotext is, even if manipulated, easy to recognise and known to the audience: this is where we find the motif (the *in flagrante* scene) and the theme (the hero as a robber/rapist). There are two allusions to classical myth in the passage: Panthia brings up Heracles’ lion-skin<sup>123</sup> and Paris.<sup>124</sup> Both are relevant in the context, since Heracles abducted Iole dressed in his lion-skin, and Paris certainly was seen as a robber and an adulterer: both acted like the “undercover herald” Hysminias. The hypotext and the ancient allusions are tied together by the common theme, “the robber in disguise”.

Makrembolites has further tied to the robber theme a dramatic vocabulary.<sup>125</sup> The speech of Panthia is as if drawn from a tragedy, which is signalled even before it begins: Panthia’s tongue is forged into a Tyrrhenian

<sup>121</sup> See Hunger (1969/70) on the identification of quotations as a popular “round game” in Byzantium. Cf. also the *auctoritas* tradition in the West; Morse (1991) argues that since medieval culture was to such a high degree permeated by literary tradition, the purpose of a text was subject to its place in a system of literary references, consisting of ancient *auctores*: “the habits of reading and writing that were engendered by education according to a variety of rhetorical assumptions created a literary culture in which the meaning of a passage or even a whole work may ultimately depend on recognition of its place in a familiar scheme of categories of style, method, and organization”, *ibid.* 17. Cf. Poljakova (1979) 120–123 on the literary *enigma* in *H&H* and its relation to the *enigma* as a genre in Byzantium.

<sup>122</sup> See above, pp. 224–227.

<sup>123</sup> *H&H* 5.3.6.

<sup>124</sup> *H&H* 5.3.5, 5.3.8.

<sup>125</sup> On the theatrical imagery in *H&H*, see Poljakova (1979) 119–120. On drama and the novel in Byzantium, see Agapitos (1998a) esp. 130–131 on the metaphorical use of theatrical vocabulary by Photios, with precedents in Plutarch, Lucian, and the Church fathers.



trumpet that tragically proclaims, κατατραγωδοῦσαν, the accusations against Hysminias. The Tyrrhenian trumpet is known from several tragedies,<sup>126</sup> whereas the verb κατατραγωδέω occurs in *L&K*. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at the passage in *L&K*, the speech in which the priest defends himself against Thersander's accusations (launched in *L&K* 8.8.8): 'ἔλυσας,' φησί, 'τὸν θανάτου κατεγνωσμένον'· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ πάνν δεινὼς ἐσχეტλίασε, τύραννον ἀποκαλῶν με καὶ ὅσα δὴ κατετραγώδησέ μου, "you released," he says, "the man condemned to death." He waxed bitterly indignant about this, calling me a tyrant and other pompous-sounding names" (*L&K* 8.9.7). We see that the word "tyrant" is used as an insult here, just as in *H&H* Panthia accused Hysminias of being a tyrant. It is also significant that it occurs in the same passage as the word κατατραγωδέω.<sup>127</sup>

After the first tragic reminiscence in *H&H* follow three allusions to Euripides, all to the *Hecuba*. In the speech of Panthia there is the quotation about the sons of Aigyptos,<sup>128</sup> which is immediately followed by the allusion to the myth of Polymnestor.<sup>129</sup> Finally, Hysminias urges the evil dream to disappear with yet another quotation, ἀποπέμπομαι ἔννυχον ὄψιν, "I dismiss this nightly vision."<sup>130</sup> As we have seen, Makrembolites often quotes from or alludes to tragedy, but the many allusions to the same play in this rather short passage are indeed conspicuous, particularly in combination with the theatrical vocabulary.<sup>131</sup> *Hecuba* is also, as we have already mentioned, one of the plays that Makrembolites most probably had read in full and knew well. The theme of the *Hecuba* is violent: its female characters are angry and avenging, just as Hysminias imagines an angry mother to appear, and the choice of this particular tragedy is thus relevant in the context.

There is yet another intertextual layer in the passage, tied to the function of the dream. If we return to Tatius, the dream of the mother triggered the

<sup>126</sup> For references, see above, p. 268, n. 41.

<sup>127</sup> On theatrical vocabulary in *L&K*, see Agapitos (1998a) 155, n. 177; note esp. *L&K* 3.17–18 and 3.15.5–6. Psellos considered *L&K* more "theatrical" (ostentatious) than the *Aithiopika*, *Synkrisis* 14–16, 67–71; Agapitos, *ibid.*, 136. On ancient drama, esp. Euripides, in the *Aithiopika*, see Pletcher (1998); on Euripides in *L&K*, see Rattenbury (1933) 256–257.

<sup>128</sup> *H&H* 5.3.8; Euripides, *Hec.* 886–887.

<sup>129</sup> The myth is related in the tragedy with a start in v. 658: Hecuba must take revenge for her son's death by killing the children of Polymnestor (vv. 981–1046); for the children as his "eyes", see v. 1035, ὡμοί, τυφλοῦμαι φέγγος ὁμμάτων τάλας.

<sup>130</sup> *H&H* 5.5.1; Euripides, *Hec.* 72.

<sup>131</sup> We may, however, note that the term *drama* is never used in this indeed "tragic" passage; conspiracy/scheme is instead referred to as σκηνή, cf. above, pp. 247–248. On negative and positive uses of *drama*, see Agapitos (1998a) 138, n. 86.

action of the novel: the couple being caught *in flagrante* caused the elopement. And in Tatius' usual enigmatic way it also mirrored a coming event: the apparent sacrifice of Leukippe in Egypt. In *H&H* the episode is placed *within* a dream, it is spatialised and exists on a different level. Hysminias' dream has also lost its proleptic aspect: even though Hysminias worries about what may happen, Kratisthenes calms him with the Aristotelian assurance that "dreams are about your daytime preoccupations."<sup>132</sup> And he is right: the dream does not reflect any future event, but instead underlines Hysminias' confused feelings before his awakening sexuality. A reader familiar with the devices of the ancient novel may expect the dream to have a foreboding function; but although Tatius' motif, and even some of the vocabulary, has been taken over by Makrembolites, he has moved the suspense to an inner level and thus thwarts the reader. To do this with a literary allusion to Aristotle was probably an appreciated device: Aristotle was read and commented on in the twelfth century, and there may be a reference here to an ongoing intellectual discussion.<sup>133</sup>

The whole dream passage is accordingly very dense and transtextually intertwining: the novelistic hypotext is combined with archi- and intertextual links to tragedy and philosophical treatises and/or commentaries. The theatrical tone correlates with the protagonists' story as a *drama*, and also with the novel as erotic fiction of a tragic character.<sup>134</sup> The Aristotelian references in the same passage correlate with the novel's character as a philosophical essay.<sup>135</sup> We may also note that this sequence is intertextual not only on a literary, but also on a sociocultural, level with the interpretation and function of the dream interacting with revived philosophical ideas, replacing the late antique ones.<sup>136</sup> The garden ekphrasis, as we have already seen, is another good example of Makrembolites' mimetic technique: using *L&K* as the constant hypotext, he covers it with different layers of literary allusion—to ancient novel conventions, to classical and contemporary literature, and to the *Song of Songs*—so as to create a complex intertextual web. Also the description of Eros shows transtextual links both to the main hypotext and to

<sup>132</sup> *H&H* 5.5.4; see above, p. 110 and n. 228.

<sup>133</sup> See above, pp. 110 and 185.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. above, pp. 247–248 on *drama*, and note Agapitos (1998a) 142: "tragedy (τραγωδία or τὰ τραγικὰ δράματα) was a rhetorical genre concentrating on human suffering and the concomitant display of emotion through speeches, without necessarily including substantial action; in certain instances it allowed for a happy conclusion."

<sup>135</sup> See above, pp. 181–186.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. the original connotations of the concept of intertextuality, e.g. Kristeva (1969).



other traditions.<sup>137</sup> This aspect of *H&H* is crucial, because it is what makes *H&H* mimetic, and at the same time original.

We may conclude that the relation between Tatius and Makrembolites is more complex than the imitation concept indicates. First of all, *L&K* is not a constant hypotext: certain elements have been picked up and expanded, whereas others have been neglected. Nor is *L&K* the only hypotext of *H&H*: other narrative settings are blended with the novelistic material, for example the philosophical essay/dialogue. The Hellenistic-Byzantine school tradition, from which the ancient quotations and allusions have been drawn, has been activated in the archaising context of the ancient novel with its ancient characters and ancient surroundings. The dialogue and part of the narrative setting are, however, Byzantine. One example is the dialogue between the protagonists in which the *pro et contra* of men and women is expressed (*H&H* 9.23): a Byzantine legend is activated through the dialogue of the characters, which is uttered in ancient quotations. Makrembolites thus archaises and “Byzantinises” at the same time.<sup>138</sup>

*H&H* offered the contemporary reader pleasure by inviting him to interpret the literary and rhetorical material. Not as riddles, because the ancient material was well known to the readers, but as recognitions, assurances of belonging to the same cultural context: the Byzantines’ communicative code of reference was based on the system of education. At the same time the novel expresses transposition and transformation of the same heritage, enriching and renewing it. Gigante’s interpretation of *H&H* as “nothing but a literary game” and a parody is thus one-sided.<sup>139</sup> The novel is partly *constructed* as a literary game, which does not exclude other layers of meaning. The literary game has artistic and creative qualities which are tied to the horizon of expectation. *H&H* is composed as a medieval representation of the ancient novel in which elements such as dreaming and psychology have been expanded, but adventure and burlesque comedy excluded. The reader is expressly invited through the external addressee Charidoux to view and judge; the novel’s function is based on the reader’s appreciation.

---

<sup>137</sup> See above, esp. pp. 202–208.

<sup>138</sup> See above, pp. 148–149.

<sup>139</sup> Gigante (1960) 169.

## Conclusions

In the introduction two aims were set forth: to clarify how *Hysmine & Hysminias* was composed, and to explain its relation to Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe & Kleitophon*. The investigation was to be carried out with some help from modern method, but with the contemporary literary context of Eumathios Makrembolites in mind. I wanted to do an analysis "from within" and try to see how the novel's revival was connected with the audience's expectations; to what purpose, with which function and significance, was the novel composed in the way it was?

We have seen how the central compositional technique in *H&H* is doubling and repetition. Central to this overall scheme is the doubling of the plot. In addition to this doubling, the novel contains a large number of repetitions of episodes, which together constitute an internal reference system of recapitulations and anticipations. There are also several lexical repetitions of words or whole phrases, and rhetorical figures of repetitive nature. The doubling and the different kinds of repetitions give an impression of epic flow and endow the work with a poetic dimension. The internal reference system and the emphasis on art are part of the work's overall spatial character, which distinguishes *H&H* from the compositional technique of the ancient novels.

There is a strong emphasis on art in *H&H*: the problematics of artistry in both painting and writing, the relationships between art and nature, art and reality, and rhetoric and reality. The symmetrical structure of the novel, which in the story has its counterpart in the homonymity of the couple (and also their sexual balance, achieved through the characterisation of a weak hero and strong heroine), underlines the artistic aspects of the work itself. Description as a text-type is central, particularly through the significance of the ekphraseis of paintings. The paintings are crucial, both as part of the repetition scheme (they are mirrored in dreams and discussions) and as expressions of the main themes: the problematics of love, the process of maturity, and the nature of art. The central motifs—the garden, the dreams of Eros, and slavery—are closely linked together through the paintings, and they are expressed *within* the garden motif, where the paintings are placed. The ekphraseis are thus key passages for the understanding of the novel's



thematics, and as ekphraseis they also contain the inherent rivalry between word and painting which returns in the epilogue when the themes are reconsidered and tied together.

The traditional plot is compressed in favour of the artistry of the text itself, but also to the benefit of the display of emotion. The action takes place on an inner level, where a personal experience of love and maturing is depicted. The text's references to time, seasons, sexual awakening, and ageing are clear, and the cyclical movement of both life, time, and space supports the textual structure, just as the textual structure emphasises the psychological (and logical) structure of the human process of maturing. In line with the focus on personal experience, fictive space and characterisation are vague, in order to bring to the fore the central space of Aulikomis and the position of the protagonists. The emotional and personal are supported also by the use of a restricted point of view and an emphasis on the narrative process.

How, then, does this composition relate to *Leukippe & Kleitophon* and how was the imitation carried out? The imitative technique of Makrembolites is based primarily on repression and amplification: different narrative elements have been either augmented or minimised, and some have been excluded. The imitation process is complex, with devices such as crosswise inversion and elaborate subversion of corresponding passages. The result is an artful transposition of the ancient model. The relationship of *H&H* to Tatius' novel should also be seen in relation to other ancient works and to contemporary literature, since Makrembolites supplements his main hypotext *L&K* with other transtexts: on a generic and formal level the philosophical essay, on a thematic and artistic level Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe*. He also brings in other narrative settings, such as the Byzantine Kassia-legend, or the atmosphere of ancient tragedy.

Can we then, by studying the mimetic relation, conclude why an imitation such as *H&H* was carried out in the way it was? In the light of the Byzantine mimesis tradition we may assume that the intertextual nature of *L&K* appealed to Makrembolites, and also that its general content constituted a suitable point of departure for the issues he wanted to explore: philosophy, eroticism, dreams, and ekphraseis. With Tatius' novel as the primary hypotext he then augmented certain aspects by bringing in other texts. Makrembolites' emphasis on the philosophical and psychological aspects of love reflects a contemporary interest in love, philosophy, and human destiny in the twelfth century. So do the mixture of ancient and Byzantine, pagan and Christian, and the experiments with tradition, such as metatextual irony and literary subversion. Makrembolites played on mixtures of genre

and motifs, composing a Byzantine essay on love and art. The ancient novel was a good object of mimesis, since the Byzantines' knowledge of its conventions allowed compression of the plot and elaborate subversion.

A prerequisite for this kind of imitation is a close relation between author and audience, where the participants share the same education and literary background; this seems to have been the very situation in twelfth-century Constantinople. There is accordingly a crucial difference between the two situations in which the ancient and the Byzantine novels were conceived. The intellectual milieu of the twelfth century allowed an intimate relation between authors, colleagues and patrons. Tatius, on the other hand, is likely to have been part of a continuous production of literature based on love and action and with the aim to entertain. This should be seen in contrast to Makrembolites' more conscious sense of art and aesthetic appreciation. The aim of Makrembolites was to please (*ἡδονή*) rather than to entertain. The novel itself illustrates this in the juxtaposition of *drama* and *diegemal/diegesis*, where *drama* represents the tragic adventures that are told, and *diegemal/diegesis* the narration which is the final product and the work of art.

The game that Makrembolites plays is serious: emotional pathos is expressed by the skills of rhetoric.





# Appendix

## Summary of *Hysmine & Hysminias*

**Book 1** The novel opens with a description of the city of Eurykomis and the feast of Diasia that takes place there. The hero-narrator Hysminias is appointed herald by drawings of lot, and after due ceremonies he sets off and sails to the city of Aulikomis, together with his relative and friend Kratisthenes. In Aulikomis Hysminias is splendidly received and entertained as a guest at Sosthenes' house, where he is offered a sumptuous meal in the beautiful garden. Sosthenes' daughter Hysmine pours the wine at dinner and Hysminias is indeed struck by her beauty, but also embarrassed by her straightforward advances: she presses her foot against his, touches his hand, whispers to him and tickles and kisses his feet at a foot-washing ceremony. Kratisthenes wakes Hysminias up in the middle of the night and interrogates him about what happened. He then laughs at the episode and mocks Hysminias' confusion.

**Book 2** Hysminias and Kratisthenes are strolling in the garden where they catch sight of a series of paintings representing the four Virtues and Eros as a king on a throne. They read the inscriptions above the paintings and "philosophise" upon them. At dinner this evening, Hysmine once again flirts with Hysminias and Kratisthenes again teases him after they have gone to bed. Hysminias denies that he is in love and thereupon falls asleep.

**Book 3** Hysminias experiences a dream in which he is brought before a furious Eros—he is in disgrace, since he has not returned Hysmine's advances. He is saved by Hysmine who begs Eros to spare him, and Hysminias becomes Eros' slave and Hysmine's "lover". Hysminias wakes up terrified and awakes Kratisthenes to tell him that he can no longer serve as Zeus' herald. Kratisthenes dismisses the whole thing ("you're in love, so what?"), and goes back to sleep, snoring. Hysminias slumbers and indulges in fantasies. When he finally dozes off he has an erotic dream about Hysmine. The next day, Hysminias has another discussion with Kratisthenes in the garden, and at the following dinner he flirts with Hysmine.

**Book 4** The dinner comes to an end, despite Hysminias' total inability to eat or drink—he is by now so taken by Hysmine. Sosthenes announces that they will travel to Eurykomis on the following day. Afterwards the young couple meet in the garden and Hysmine expresses her surprise at Hysminias' changed behaviour. He is worried about leaving Hysmine, but she tells him that she too will be coming to Eurykomis. Since Hysminias cannot sleep, he spends some time in the garden. First he "philosophises" with Kratisthenes about the last painting in the series, representing the twelve months. Then he meets Hysmine, but the couple are interrupted by a woman who calls Hysmine into the house. At last Hysminias goes to bed, talks with Kratisthenes and eventually manages to sleep.

**Book 5** Hysminias experiences a whole series of dreams: he dreams of Hysmine in an erotic embrace, of Hysmine as a bride, and of a meeting with her in the garden. But Hysmine's mother Panthia catches the couple *in flagrante* and the episode closes with Hysminias being chased by a host of crazy women, commanded by Panthia. He awakes terrified by Kratisthenes shaking him up; Sosthenes is at the door and it is time for the ceremonious



return to Eurykomis. Hysminias' parents arrive and the two families set off to Eurykomis where dinner is served at the house of Themisteus, Hysminias' father. At night, the parents depart to make sacrifice to Zeus and Hysminias steals off to the bed of Hysmine. He suggests that they should make a sacrifice to Eros, but the girl does not want to give up her virginity. They swear eternal fidelity to each other.

**Book 6** When Dianteia, Hysminias' mother, returns from the sacrifice she wakes her son up, since it is time to eat. Sosthenes declares that he has found a good match for his daughter and that they will go back to Aulikomis for the wedding. The parents depart for another sacrifice, this time for Hysmine's coming marriage. The young couple is perplexed, and once again Hysminias sneaks into Hysmine's bedroom and together they bitterly lament their cruel fate. They discuss the possibility of running away together. Since Hysminias cannot sleep, he goes to the altar and sees that bad omens occur at the sacrifice. The company returns to the house and discusses the wedding and the bad signs. Kratisthenes arrives to report that he has found a ship on which Hysmine and Hysminias can elope to Syria. Hysminias goes to sleep and dreams of the waves of the sea and of Eros, who now leaves Hysmine in his hands.

**Book 7** The parents return to the altar and just as Hysminias is telling Hysmine about his dream and the coming elopement, Kratisthenes comes to announce that they now have to leave, since the ship is waiting in the harbour. After a prayer to Poseidon they put out and sail with a fair wind and fine weather. The couple are happily lulled by the waves. But the next day the wind rises and the captain decides that a sacrifice has to be made to appease Poseidon. The sacrifice falls on Hysmine's lot. She is thrown overboard, Hysminias desperately wailing and the captain delivering a rhetorical speech, and she disappears in the waves. Hysminias' laments are so annoying that he is put ashore on a beach where he falls asleep crying, dreaming that Hysmine is saved by Eros.

**Book 8** Ethiopian pirates find Hysminias on the beach, he is taken prisoner and brought onto the ship with which the pirates are undertaking wild plundering. After three days, the pirates meet with a Greek army and they all, pirates as well as their captives, become prisoners. They are taken to Daphnepolis, where Hysminias is sold as a slave. His new mistress makes constant sexual advances, which Hysminias tries to avoid. Time passes, and the time of Diasia comes around. In Daphnepolis, Diasia is not celebrated, but at the same time of the year a feast to Apollo takes place. The master of Hysminias becomes herald and he brings Hysminias to Artykomis.

**Book 9** Hysminias nostalgically remembers his own period as a herald. At the house of their host Sostratos one of the slave girls looks like Hysmine, and, to be sure, he soon gets a letter in which she tells him how she was saved by a dolphin and sold as a slave. Sostratos' daughter Rhodope falls in love with Hysminias and makes Hysmine her *mediatrix*. Thus the loving couple are able to meet again, while Hysminias is harassed by both Rhodope and his own mistress.

**Book 10** Letters are exchanged between Rhodope and Hysminias, delivered by Hysmine. One night, as part of the feast, all members of the house—masters as well as slaves—go to the altar of Apollo, where two couples are found lamenting their runaway children. These are Sosthenes and Themisteus with wives. There is a recognition scene, the priest of

Apollo intervenes to declare Hysmine and Hysminias free under the vigorous protests of Rhodope and Sostratos, after which the reunion and the release are celebrated.

**Book 11** The feasting continues. During a dinner at the priest's house Hysmine and Hysminias tell their adventures. It is concluded that Hysmine's virginity should be tried in the spring of Artemis in Daphnepolis. She passes the test and they all return happily to Aulikomis where the wedding takes place in the garden of Sosthenes. Hysminias closes the story with a wish for immortality and continuance of this his erotic *drama* and book.

## Summary of *Leukippe & Kleitophon*

**Book 1** The novel opens with an initial author—"I"—having arrived in Sidon, where he chances upon a painting representing Zeus' abduction of Europa. A young man approaches him and sighs at Eros' power; this is the hero-narrator Kleitophon, whose tale of love is the novel proper.

Kleitophon comes from Tyre. He was betrothed to his half-sister Kalligone, when his uncle Sostratos sent his wife Pantheia and daughter Leukippe to stay with the family in Tyre. As soon as Kleitophon caught sight of Leukippe he fell in love with her. He asked his cousin Kleinias for advice, and with his and the slave Satyros' co-operation, he wooed Leukippe. Book 1 closes with a description of the garden and the stories of love that Kleitophon told there in order to impress Leukippe.

**Book 2** Kleitophon continued to woo Leukippe. His wedding to Kalligone was delayed by a bad omen. Then Kalligone was suddenly abducted by a certain Kallisthenes, who had fallen in love with Leukippe without even having seen her, and mistook Kalligone for her. Kleitophon finally convinced Leukippe to receive him in her bedroom, but they were caught *in flagrante* by her mother, and Kleitophon barely made his escape. Leukippe's mother did not believe her daughter's assurance that her virginity was still intact, and Leukippe therefore decided to elope with Kleitophon. Along with Kleinias and Satyros they boarded a ship bound for Alexandria, where they made friends with the Egyptian Menelaos who, just like Kleinias, had accidental responsibility for the death of his lover. Their discussions on the subject of hetero- and homosexual love closes book 2.

**Book 3** On the third day a heavy storm caused a shipwreck. Leukippe and Kleitophon were washed ashore at Pelusium, from where they travelled towards Alexandria through the Nile delta. They were attacked by brigands who captured Leukippe, while Kleitophon was rescued by soldiers and entertained by the commander Charmides. Leukippe was apparently sacrificed on an altar before the very eyes of Kleitophon, and the body was put in a coffin. When Kleitophon planned to kill himself over the coffin he met Menelaos and Satyros, who opened it and showed him that Leukippe was alive. They told him how they had survived the shipwreck and faked the sacrifice of Leukippe. The book finishes with Charmides telling the myth of the bird Phoenix.

**Book 4** Leukippe and Kleitophon, Menelaos and Satyros stayed in safety in the soldiers' camp. Kleitophon tried to persuade Leukippe to sleep with him, but she refused and told him that Artemis had appeared to her in a dream. Meanwhile, Charmides had fallen in love with Leukippe and wanted Menelaos to persuade her to take him as a lover. Leukippe,



however, was suddenly seized by a fit of madness. It eventually turned out that the illness was caused by an overdose of love philtre; one of the soldiers had fallen in love with Leukippe and had had his servant give her the aphrodisiac. The soldier's other servant Chaireas prepared an antidote that restored her to sanity, and they all then travelled with this Chaireas to Alexandria, where he lived on the island of Pharos. Book 3 closes with a praise of the water of the Nile and a description of the crocodile.

**Book 5** The book opens with a description of Alexandria. Chaireas, who had fallen in love with Leukippe, arranged for a band of pirates to kidnap her. Kleitophon pursued the ship, but he saw Leukippe being beheaded and thrown into the sea. He was inconsolable, but Menelaos convinced him to live on. After six months he met Kleinias, whom he had thought to be dead. Kleitophon agreed to marry the young and beautiful widow Melite and travel with her to Ephesos; he would, however, not sleep with her before they arrived to her home. Satyros and Kleinias came with them. In Ephesos, it emerged that one of Melite's slave girls was in fact Leukippe; the steward Sosthenes had bought her from the pirates. It also turned out that Melite's husband Thersander was not dead, and Kleitophon was imprisoned for adultery. Melite had by now found out the whole truth about him and Leukippe and persuaded Kleitophon to "heal her love-sickness", which he did.

**Book 6** Afterwards, Melite arranged a safe escape for Kleitophon. Meanwhile, Leukippe was held captive in a hut on the country estate by Sosthenes and Thersander, and Thersander was starting to desire Leukippe. When Thersander returned to the city, he ran into the fugitive Kleitophon, who was caught and thrown in jail.

**Book 7** Thersander, who had found out that Kleitophon was Leukippe's husband, plotted against Kleitophon and made him believe that Leukippe was murdered. When he was brought to his trial for adultery, Kleitophon implicated himself in Leukippe's murder, because he wanted to die. The trials were long and complicated, and Kleitophon was sentenced to death. Meanwhile, Leukippe managed to escape and take refuge in the temple of Artemis. Her father Sostratos suddenly arrived in Ephesos with an embassy, since a dream had shown him that he would find the couple there. Because of the arrival of the embassy, and with the assistance of the priest of Artemis, Kleitophon was temporarily released. A temple-attendant reported to the priest about the girl taken refuge with Artemis, and Leukippe was eventually found in the temple.

**Book 8** Thersander arrived to the temple and made a fuss. He demanded capital punishment for Kleitophon and the trial of the Syrx for Leukippe. At night they had dinner at the priest's house, where Kleitophon told their story. The next day trials were resumed, and Thersander challenged both Leukippe and Melite to chastity ordeals. Both women passed. Sosthenes then told the truth about the whole plot, and Thersander was sentenced to exile. At a dinner at the priest's house Leukippe told her part of the story. Her father Sostratos also told them that Kalligone and Kallisthenes had fallen in love and were to be married. Leukippe and Kleitophon sailed first to Byzantium to celebrate their marriage and then to Tyre, where they took part in the wedding of Kalligone and Kallisthenes. They decided to spend the winter there and then go on to Byzantium.

# Bibliography

The bibliography includes only works referred to in this study.

## List of abbreviations

BMGS	<i>Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies</i>
Byz	<i>Byzantion</i>
ByzF	<i>Byzantinische Forschungen</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
JÖB	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
LBG	<i>Lexikon der byzantinischen Gräzität</i> , fasc. 1– (Vienna 1994–)
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , 3 vols. (Oxford and New York 1991)

## Editions

This list includes only editions of Byzantine literature, and only those that contain minor and perhaps less known Byzantine texts, which may be hard to locate. Other Byzantine and ancient texts are quoted from standard editions. The Komnenian novels are quoted from Conca's edition of 1994 (= Conca 1994a).

- Basilakes, Nikephoros. *Progimnasmi e monodie*. Ed. by A. Pignani. Byzantina e Neo-Hellenica, Collana di studi e testi, no. 10. Naples 1983.
- Basilakes, Nikephoros. *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*. Ed. by A. Garzya. Leipzig 1984.
- Daphnopates, Theodoros. *Theodore Daphnopatès. Correspondance*. Ed. by J. Darrouzès and L. G. Westerink. Le monde byzantin. Paris 1978.
- Geometres, John. *The Progymnasmata of John Geometres*. Ed. by A. R. Littlewood. Amsterdam 1972.
- Italikos, Michael. *Lettres et discours*. Ed. by P. Gautier. Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 14. Paris 1972.
- Kataskepenos, Nikolaos. *La vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote moine byzantin*. Ed. by E. Sargologos. Brussels 1964.
- Life of St Irene, Abbess of Chrysobalanton. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Indices*. Ed. by J. O. Rosenqvist. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 1. Uppsala 1986.
- Manganeios Prodromos. *Theodori Prodromi De Manganis*. Ed. by S. Bernardinello. Padova 1972.
- Psellos, Michael. *De Operatione Daemonum*. Ed. by J. F. Boissonade. Amsterdam 1964. Reprint of Nuremberg 1838.



- Psellos, Michael. *The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Ed. by A. R. Dyck. Byzantina Vindobonensia 16. Vienna 1986.
- Psellos, Michael. *Michaeli Pselli Oratoria Minora*. Ed. by A. R. Littlewood. Leipzig 1985.
- Psellos, Michael. *Michaeli Pselli Philosophica Minora I: Opuscula logica, physica, allegorica, alia*. Ed. by J. M. Duffy. Stuttgart and Leipzig 1992.
- Psellos, Michael. *Michaeli Pselli Poemata*. Ed. by L. G. Westerink. Stuttgart and Leipzig 1992.
- Photios. *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*. Vol. 1: *Epistularum pars prima*. Ed. by B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink. Leipzig 1983.
- Symeon the New Theologian. *Symeon Neos Theologos. Hymnen*. Ed. by A. Kambylis. Berlin 1978.
- Synesios. *Opere di Sinesio di Cirene. Epistole Operette Inni*. Ed. by A. Garzya. Turin 1989.
- Theophylact of Ochrid. *Théophylacte d'Achrida. Discours, traités, poésies*. Ed. by P. Gautier. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 16/1. Thessalonica 1980.
- Tzetzes, John. *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*. Ed. by J. F. Boissonade. Hildesheim 1967. Reprint of Paris 1851.
- Tzetzes, John. *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*. Ed. by P. A. M. Leone. Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di filologia classica. Università degli studi di Napoli 1. Napoli 1968.

## General works

- Acconcia Longo, A. 1991a. "Filippo il Filosofo a Constantinopoli." *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 28: 3–21.
- Acconcia Longo, A. 1991b. "La Vita di S. Leone di Catania." In S. Pricoco, F. Rizzo Nervo, and T. Sardella (eds.), *Sicilia e Italia suburbicaria tra IV e VIII secolo*: 215–226. Catania 1991.
- Adams, P. G. 1983. *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*. Lexington, Ky.
- Aerts, W. J. 1997. "Das literarische Porträt in der byzantinischen Literatur." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 8: 151–195.
- Afinogenov, D. 1997. "The Bride-Show of Theophilos: Some Notes on the Sources." *Eranos* 95: 10–18.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1989a. "Η εικόνα του αυτοκράτορα Βασιλείου Α' στην φιλομακεδονική γραμματεία 867–957." *Hellenika* 40: 285–322.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1989b. "Michael Italikos, Klage auf den Tod seines Rebhuhns." *BZ* 82: 59–68.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1990. "The Erotic Bath in the Byzantine Vernacular Romance *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe*." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 41: 257–273.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1991. *Narrative Structure in the Byzantine Vernacular Romances. A textual and literary study of Kallimachos, Belthandros and Libistros*. Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia 34. Munich.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1992. "Byzantine Literature and Greek Philologists in the Nineteenth Century." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 43: 231–260.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1998a. "Narrative, Rhetoric and 'Drama' Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium interpret Heliodorus." In Hunter (1998) 125–156.
- Agapitos, P. A. 1998b. "Mischung der Gattungen und Überschreitung der Gesetze: Die Grabrede des Eustathios von Thessalonike auf Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites." *JÖB* 48: 119–146.

- Agapitos, P. A. 1999. "Dreams and the Spatial Aesthetics of Narrative Presentation in *Livistros and Rhodamne*." *DOP* 53: 111–147.
- Agapitos, P. A. 2000a. "Poets and Painters: Theodoros Prodromos' Dedicatory Verses of his Novel to an Anonymous Caesar." *JÖB* 50: 173–185.
- Agapitos, P. A. 2000b. "Der Roman der Komnenenzeit: Stand der Forschung und weitere Perspektiven." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 1–18.
- Agapitos, P. A., and Reinsch, D. R., eds. 2000. *Der Roman im Byzanz der Komnenenzeit. Ein internationales Symposium. Referate des Internationalen Symposiums an der Freien Universität Berlin, 3.-6. April 1998*. Meletemata 8. Wiesbaden.
- Agapitos, P. A., and Smith, O. L. 1992. *The Study of Medieval Greek Romance: A reassessment of recent work*. Opuscula Graecolatina 33. Copenhagen.
- Åkerström-Hougen, G. 1974. *The Calendar and hunting mosaics of the villa of the Falconer in Argos. A Study in early Byzantine Iconography*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen. Stockholm.
- Alexiou, M. 1977. "A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*." *BMGS* 3: 23–43.
- Alexiou, M. 1982/83. "Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the *Timarion* (ch. 6–10)." *BMGS* 8: 29–45.
- Alexiou, M. 1986. "The Poverty of *Écriture* and the Craft of Writing: Towards a Reappraisal of the Prodromic Poems." *BMGS* 10: 1–40.
- Alexiou, M. 1999. "Ploys of Performance: Games and Plays in the Ptochoprodromic Poems." *DOP* 53: 91–109.
- Alpers, P. 1996. *What is Pastoral?* Chicago.
- Alvarez, J. 1996. "Maps." In Schmeling (1996) 801–814.
- Anastasi, R. 1969. "Sul romanzo di Constantino Manasse." *Rivista di cultura classica e medievale* 11: 214–236.
- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sofistes. Ancient Novelists at Play*. Chico, CA.
- Anderson, G. 1986. *Philostratus, Biography and Belles-Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* London.
- Anderson, G. 1988. "Achilles Tatius: a New Interpretation." In Beaton (1988) 190–193.
- Anderson, G. 1990. "The Second Sophistic: Some Problems of Perspective." In Russell (1990) 91–110.
- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London and New York.
- Anderson, G. 1997. "Perspectives on Achilles Tatius." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 34.3: 2278–2299. Berlin.
- Auerbach, E. 1974. *Mimesis: the representation of reality in Western literature*. Princeton, N. J. First published in German 1964.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. by M. Holquist. Austin, Texas.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. by C. Emerson. Minneapolis.
- Bal, M. 1983. "The Narrating and the Focalizing: A Theory of the Agents in Narrative." *Style* 17: 234–269.
- Bal, M. 1985. *Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto.
- Bal, M. 1991. *On Story-Telling. Essays in Narratology*. Sonoma, CA.
- Baldwin, B. 1984. *Timarion. Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Detroit.
- Baldwin, B. 1995. "Plutarch in Byzantium." *Byz* 65: 525–526.



## 298 Bibliography

- Barber, C. 1992. "Reading the Garden in Byzantium: Nature and Sexuality." *BMGS* 16: 1–19.
- Barth, J. 1967. "The Literature of Exhaustion." *Atlantic* 220.2 (August 1967): 29–34.
- Barthes, R. 1982. "The Reality Effect." In T. Todorov (ed.), *French Literary Theory Today. A Reader*: 11–17. Cambridge 1982. First published as "L'effet de réel" in *Communications* 11 (1968): 84–89.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton, N. J.
- Beaton, R., ed. 1988. *The Greek Novel, A.D. 1–1985*. London.
- Beaton, R. 1995. "Epic and Romance in the Twelfth Century." In Littlewood (1995) 81–91.
- Beaton, R. 1996<sup>2</sup>. *The Medieval Greek Romance*. London and New York. First published 1989.
- Beaton, R. 1997. "Critical Studies. 'In the Goddess' name I summon you': Byzantine and Modern (Greek) Fortunes of the Ancient Novel." *BMGS* 21: 231–245.
- Beaton, R. 2000. "The World of Fiction and the World 'out there': the Case of the Byzantine Novel." In D. C. Smythe (ed.), *Strangers to Themselves: the Byzantine Outsider* (Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998): 79–188. Aldershot 2000.
- Beaujour, M. 1980. "Some Paradoxes of Description." In Kittay (1980) 27–59.
- Beck, H.-G. 1975. "Der Leserkreis der byzantinischen 'Volksliteratur' im Licht der handschriftlichen Überlieferung." In *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*. Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium 1971: 47–67. Washington D.C.
- Beck, H.-G. 1977. "Marginalia on the Byzantine Novel." In Reardon (1977) 59–65.
- Beck, H.-G. 1984. *Byzantinisches Erotikon. Orthodoxie – Literatur – Gesellschaft*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 1984, no. 5. Munich.
- Becker, A. S. 1995. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetic of Ekphrasis*. Lanham.
- Benson, R. L., and Constable, G., eds. 1982. *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Oxford.
- Bernardinello, S. 1972. See Editions, Manganeios Prodromos.
- Bertoni, C., and Fusillo M. 1998. "Heliodorus Parthenopaeus: The *Aithiopika* in Baroque Naples." In Hunter (1998) 157–181.
- Billault, A. 1991. *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque impériale*. Paris.
- Billault, A. 1992. "Cervantès et Héliodore." In M.-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and M. Trédé (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec. Actes du colloque international tenu à l'École normale supérieure (Paris 17-19 décembre 1987)*: 307–314. Paris 1992.
- Billault, A. 1996. "Characterization in the Ancient Novel." In Schmeling (1996) 115–129.
- Binder, G., and Effe, B., eds. 1993. *Liebe und Leidenschaft. Historische Aspekte von Erotik und Sexualität*. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 12. Trier.
- Birchall, J. 1996. "The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 7: 1–17.
- Bloom, H. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York.
- Boissonade, J. F. 1964. See Editions, Michael Psellos.
- Boissonade, J. F. 1967. See Editions, John Tzetzes.
- Bolgar, R. 1981. "The Classical Tradition: Legend and Reality." In Mullett & Scott (1981) 7–19.
- Booth, W. C. 1974. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago.

- Booth, W. C. 1983<sup>2</sup>. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago. First published 1961.
- Booth, W. C. 1988. "Distance and Point of View: An Essay in Classification." In Hoffman & Murphy (1988) 170–189. First published 1961.
- Boswell, J. 1981. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*. Chicago.
- Bowersock, G. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. London.
- Bowie, E. 1982. "The Importance of the Sophists." In J. J. Winkler and G. Williams (eds.), *Later Greek Literature* (Yale Classical Studies 27): 29–59. Cambridge 1982.
- Bowie, E. 1985. "The Greek Novel." In P. Easterling and B. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I*: 683–699. Cambridge 1985.
- Bowie, E. 1994a. "The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World." In Tatum (1994) 435–459.
- Bowie, E. 1994b. "Philostratus: Writer of Fiction." In Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 181–199.
- Bowie, E. 1996. "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels." In Schmeling (1996) 87–106.
- Bremond, C. 1973. *Logique du récit*. Paris.
- Brett, G. 1954. "The Automata in the Byzantine Throne of Solomon," *Speculum* 29: 477–487.
- Brown (1993) = *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory. Approaches, Scholars, Terms*: 642–646. Ed. by I. R. Makaryk. Toronto.
- Browning, R. 1962. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century." *Byz* 32: 167–202.
- Browning, R. 1963. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century [Continuation]." *Byz* 33: 11–40.
- Browning, R. 1975a. "Enlightenment and Repression in Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Past and Present* 69: 3–23.
- Browning, R. 1975b. "Homer in Byzantium." *Viator* 6: 15–33.
- Bruns, G. L. 1982. *Inventions: Writing, Textuality and Understanding in Literary History*. New Haven.
- Bullough, V. L. 1976. *Sexual Variance in Society and History*. New York.
- Burton, J. J. 1998. "Reviving the Pagan Greek Novel in a Christian World." *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 39: 179–216.
- Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.
- Cameron, A. 1997. "Sacred and Profane Love: Thoughts on Byzantine Gender." In James (1997) 1–23.
- Cataldi-Palau, A. C. 1980. "La tradition manuscrite d' Eustathe Makrembolitès." *Revue d' Histoire de Textes* 10: 75–113.
- Chalk, H. H. O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80: 32–51.
- Chatman, S. B. 1990. *Coming to Terms: the Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, N. Y.
- Chatzizis, A. C. 1930. 'Ομηρικαὶ ἔρευναι I.1. Προλεγόμενα εἰς τὴν τοῦ Εὐσταθίου Μακρεμβολίτου Ἀκριτηΐδα καὶ τὰς διασκευὰς αὐτῆς. Athens.
- Chew, K. 2000. "Achilles Tatius and Parody." *The Classical Journal* 96: 57–70.
- Ciggaar, K. N. 1996. *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations*. Leiden.
- Cizek, A. N. 1994. *Imitatio et tractatio. Die literarisch-rhetorischen Grundlagen der Nachahmung in Antike und Mittelalter*. Tübingen.
- Clark, D. L. 1957. *Rhetoric in Graeco-Roman Education*. New York.



- Clayton, J., and Rothstein, E., eds. 1991. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison, Wis.
- Cohn, D. C. 1978. *Transparent Minds. Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton, N. J.
- Colonna, A., ed. 1938. *Heliodoros. Aethiopika*. Rome.
- Conca, F., ed. 1990. *Niketas Eugenianos. De Drosillae et Chariclis Amoribus*. London studies in classical philology 24. Amsterdam.
- Conca, F., ed. 1994a. *Il romanzo bizantino del XII secolo. Teodoro Prodromo - Niceta Eugenio - Eustazio Macrembolita - Constantino Manasse*. Turin.
- Conca, F. 1994b. "Il romanzo di Eustazio Macrembolita fra tardo antico e bizantino." In *Syndesmos* 2: 89–107. Studi in onore di Rosario Anastasi. Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Catania.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Translated, edited and with a foreword by C. Segal. Ithaca, N. Y.
- Cupane, C. 1974. "Ἔρως βασιλεύς: la figura di Eros nel romanzo bizantino d'amore." *Atti dell' Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arte di Palermo*, serie 4, 33/2: 243–297.
- Cupane, C. 1978. "Il motivo del castello nella narrativa tardo-bizantina." *JÖB* 27: 229–267.
- Cupane, C. 1987. "Byzantinisches Erotikon: Ansichten und Einsichten." *JÖB* 37: 213–233.
- Cupane, C. 1992. Review of Plepelits (1989). *JÖB* 42: 384–390.
- Cupane, C. 1996. Review of Conca (1994a). *BZ* 89: 96–101.
- Cupane, C. 2000. "Metamorphosen des Eros. Liebesdarstellung und Liebesdiskurs in der byzantinischen Literatur der Komnenenzeit." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 25–54.
- Curtius, E. R. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Bollingen series 36. London. First published in German 1948.
- Daemmrich, H. S., and Daemmrich, I. 1987. *Themes and Motifs in Western Literature. A Handbook*. Tübingen.
- Daly, P. M. 1979. *Literature in the Light of the Emblem: Structural Parallels between the Emblem and Literature in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Toronto.
- Darrouzès, J., and Westerink, L. G. 1978. See Editions, Theodoros Daphnopoulos.
- De Jong, I., and Sullivan, J. P., eds. 1994. *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*. Leiden.
- Dennis, G. T. 1997a. "Were the Byzantines Creative or Merely Imitative?" *ByzF* 24: 1–9.
- Dennis, G. T. 1997b. "Imperial Panegyric: Rhetoric and Reality." In Maguire (1997) 131–140.
- Dihle, A. 1994. *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Justinian*. London and New York. First published in German 1989.
- Doody, M. A. 1994. "Heliodoros Rewritten: Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* and Frances Burney's *Wanderer*." In Tatum (1994) 117–131.
- Doody, M. A. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick.
- Dostálová, R. 1993. "ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΕΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΚΟΝΑ (zur Bildekphrasis des Eros im Roman des Eustathios Makrembolites)." *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica* 2. *Graecolatina Pragensia* 14: 45–52. Prague.
- Downey (1959) = *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 4: 921–944.
- Duffy, J. M. 1992. See Editions, Michael Psellos.
- Dunlop, J. C. 1888. *History of Prose Fiction*, vol. 1. Revd. H. Wilson; first published 1814. London.
- Durham, D. B. 1938. "Parody in Achilles Tatius." *Classical Philology* 33: 1–19.

- Dyck, A. R. 1986. See Editions, Michael Psellos.
- Effe, B. 1993. "Die Emanzipation des Eros in der griechischen Dichtung." In Binder & Effe (1993) 25–44.
- Egger, M. B. 1988. "Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman. Die Frau als Heldin und Leserin." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 1: 33–66.
- Egger, M. B. 1994. "Women and Marriage in the Greek Novels: The Boundaries of Romance." In Tatum (1994) 260–280.
- Eideneier, H. 1979. "Ein byzantinisches Kalendergedicht in der Volkssprache." *Hellenika* 33: 368–419.
- Eideneier, H., ed. 1991. *Ptochoprodromos: Einführung, kritische Ausgabe, deutsche Übersetzung, Glossar*. Cologne.
- Fairbanks (1931) = Philostratus the Elder, *Imagines*. Philostratus the Younger, *Imagines*. Callistratus, *Descriptions*. With an English translation by A. Fairbanks. The Loeb Classical Library. London.
- Ferruolo, S. C. 1984. "The Twelfth-Century Renaissance." In Treadgold (1984) 114–143.
- Forehand, W. E. 1976. "Symbolic Gardens in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." *Eranos* 74: 102–112.
- Forster, E. M. 1927. *Aspects of the Novel*. London.
- Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford.
- Fowler, D. 1989. "First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects." *Materiale e discussione per l'analisi dei testi classici* 22: 75–122.
- Fowler, D. 1994. "Postmodernism, Romantic Irony, and Classical Closure." In De Jong & Sullivan (1994) 231–256.
- Fowler, D. 1997. "Second Thoughts on Closure." In Roberts, Dunn & Fowler (1997) 3–22.
- Frank, J. 1981. "Spatial Form: Thirty Years After." In Smitten & Daghistany (1981) 202–243. Reprinted in revised version in Frank (1991) 109–132.
- Frank, J. 1991. *The Idea of Spatial Form*. New Brunswick.
- Freedman, R. 1963. *The Lyrical Novel. Studies in Hermann Hesse, André Gide, and Virginia Woolf*. Princeton, N. J.
- Frede, M. 1992. "Plato's Arguments and the Dialogue Form." In Klagge & Smith (1992) 201–219.
- Frye, N. 1963. "Literary Criticism." In J. Thorpe (ed.), *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literature*: 57–69. New York 1963.
- Fusillo, M. 1991. *Naissance du roman*. Paris. First published in Italian 1989.
- Fusillo, M. 1996. "Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel." In Schmeling (1996) 277–305.
- Fusillo, M. 1997. "How Novels End. Some Patterns of Closure in Hellenistic Narrative." In Roberts, Dunn & Fowler (1997) 209–227.
- Futre Pinheiro, M. 1996. "The *Nachleben* of the Ancient Novel in Iberian Literature in the Sixteenth Century." In Schmeling (1996) 775–799.
- Galatariotou, C. 1987a. "Structural Oppositions in the Grottaferrata *Digenes Akrites*." *BMGS* 11: 29–68.
- Galatariotou, C. 1987b. "Byzantine *Ktetoriaka Typika*: A Comparative Study." *Revue des Études Byzantines* 45: 77–138.
- Garland, L. 1988. "The Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women." *Byz* 58: 361–393.



- Garland, L. 1990. "'Be Amorous, but be Chaste...' Sexual Morality in Byzantine Learned and Vernacular Romance." *BMGS* 14: 62–120.
- Gärtner, H. 1969. "Charikleia in Byzanz." *Antike und Abendland* 15: 47–69.
- Gärtner, H. 1971. "Johannes Eugenikos, Protheoria zu Heliodors *Aithiopika*." *BZ* 64: 322–325.
- Garzya, A. 1971. "Per la fortuna di Saffo a Bisanzio." *JÖB* 20: 1–5.
- Garzya, A. 1984. See Editions, Nikephoros Basilakes.
- Garzya, A. 1989. See Editions, Synesios.
- Gaselee (1947) = Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*. With an English Translation by S. Gaselee. First printed 1917. The Loeb Classical Library. London.
- Gautier, P. 1972. See Editions, Michael Italikos.
- Gautier, P. 1980. See Editions, Theophylact of Ochrid.
- Gelley, A. 1979. "The Represented World: Toward a Phenomological Theory of Description in the Novel." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 38, 4: 415–422.
- Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse*. Oxford. First published in French 1972.
- Genette, G. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris.
- Genette, G. 1988. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. New York. First published in French 1983.
- Genette, G. 1992. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Berkeley. First published in French 1979.
- Genette, G. 1997. *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln, Neb. First published in French 1982.
- Gianelli, 1963. "Tetrastici di Teodoro Prodromo sulle feste fisse e sui santi del calendario bizantino." *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 10: 255–289. First published in *Analecta Bollandiana* 75 (1957): 299–336.
- Giangrande, G. 1962. "On the Origins of the Greek Romance: the Birth of a Literary Form." *Eranos* 60: 132–159.
- Gigante, M. 1960. "Il romanzo di Eustathios Makrembolites." *Akten des XI. internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses (München 1958)*: 168–181. Munich.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity. Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge.
- Gouma-Peterson, T., ed. 2000. *Anna Komnene and her Times*. London and New York.
- Hägg, T. 1966. "Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon Ephesios: Original oder Epitome?" *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27: 118–161.
- Hägg, T. 1971a. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*. Skrifter utgivna av svenska institutet i Athen. Stockholm.
- Hägg, T. 1971b. "The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesius." *Eranos* 69: 25–59.
- Hägg, T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Hägg, T. 1984. "The Parthenope Romance Decapitated?" *Symbolae Osloenses* 59: 61–92.
- Hägg, T. 1985. "Metiochus at Polycrates' Court." *Eranos* 83: 92–102.
- Hägg, T. 1987. "Callirhoe and Parthenope: The Beginnings of the Historical Novel." *Classical Antiquity* 6: 184–204.
- Hägg, T. 1989. "Hermes and the Invention of the Lyre. An Unorthodox Version." *Symbolae Osloenses* 64: 36–73.
- Hägg, T. 1992. Review of Bartsch (1989). *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112: 192–193.

- Hägg, T. 1994. "Orality, Literacy, and the 'Readership' of the Early Greek Novel." In R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative. The European Tradition*: 47–81. Berlin 1994.
- Halperin, D. M. 1992. "Plato and the Erotics of Narrativity." In Klagge & Smith (1992) 93–129.
- Hamon, P. 1977. "Pour un statut sémiologique du personnage." In R. Barthes et al., *Poétique du récit*: 115–180. Paris 1977.
- Hamon, P. 1980. "Rhetorical Status of the Descriptive." In Kittay (1980) 1–26.
- Hamon, P. 1981. *Introduction à l'analyse du descriptif*. Paris.
- Hanawalt, E. A. 1986. "Dancing with Rhetoricians in the Gardens of the Muses: Notes on Recent Study and Appreciation of Byzantine Literature." *Byzantine Studies—Études Byzantines* 13: 1–23.
- Harder, R. 1997a. "Diskurse über die Gastlichkeit im Roman des Theodoros Prodromos." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 8: 132–149.
- Harder, R. 1997b. "Die Funktion der Briefe im byzantinischen Roman des 12. Jahrhunderts." In Picone & Zimmermann (1997) 231–244.
- Harder, R. 2000. "Religion und Glaube in den Romanen der Komnenenzeit." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 55–80.
- Harvey, A. E. 1989. *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200*. Cambridge.
- Heffernan, J. A. 1991. "Ekphrasis and Representation." *New Literary History* 22: 297–316.
- Heffernan, J. A. 1993. *Museum of Words. The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery*. Chicago.
- Heisenberg, A. 1903. "Eustathios." *Rheinisches Museum* 58: 427–435.
- Heiserman, A. R. 1977. *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginning of Prose Fiction in the West*. Chicago.
- Hercher, R., ed. 1859. *Erotici Graeci*. vol. 2. Leipzig.
- Hilberg, I., ed. 1876. 'Ευσταθίου Πρωτονωβελεσίμου τοῦ Μακρεμβολίτου τῶν καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν λόγοι ια'. Vienna.
- Hill, B., ed. 1999. *Imperial Women in Byzantium 1025–1204. Power, Patronage and Ideology*. Harlow.
- Hock, R. F. 1997. "The Rhetoric of Romance." In S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*: 445–465. Leiden 1997.
- Hoffman, M. J., and Murphy, P. D., eds. 1988. *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*. Durham.
- Hoffmann, G. 1978. *Raum, Situation, erzählte Wirklichkeit. Poetologische und historische Studien zum englischen und amerikanischen Roman*. Stuttgart.
- Hohlweg (1971) = *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst* 2: 33–75.
- Holzberg, N. 1986. *Der Antike Roman: Eine Einführung*. Munich.
- Holzberg, N. 1996. "The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe." In Schmeling (1996) 11–28.
- Hörandner, W., ed. 1974. *Theodoros Prodromos. Historische Gedichte*. Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 11. Vienna.
- Horna, K. 1903. "Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon." *Wiener Studien* 25: 165–217.
- Huet, P.D. 1670. *Traité de l'origine des romans*. Paris. Reprinted Stuttgart 1966.
- Hunger, H. 1954. "Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes." *JÖB* 3: 35–54.



- Hunger, H. 1965. *Reich der neuen Mitte. Der Christliche Geist der byzantinischen Kultur*. Graz, Vienna, and Cologne.
- Hunger, H. 1968. "Die byzantinische Literatur der Komnenenzeit. Versuch einer Neubewertung." *Anzeiger phil.-hist. Klasse Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1968, no. 105: 59–76. Reprinted in Hunger (1973) as no. 16.
- Hunger, H. 1969/70. "On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23–24: 17–38. Reprinted in Hunger (1973) as no. 15.
- Hunger, H. 1973. *Byzantinistische Grundlagenforschung. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Variorum reprints. London.
- Hunger, H. 1978. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 12.5.1–2. Munich.
- Hunger, H. 1980. *Antiker und byzantinischer Roman*. Heidelberg.
- Hunger, H. 1981. "The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Literature: the Importance of Rhetoric." In Mullett & Scott (1981) 35–48.
- Hunger, H. 1998. "Die Makremboliten auf byzantinischen Bleisiegeln und in sonstigen Belegen." *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 5: 1–28.
- Hunter, R. L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L., ed. 1998. *Studies in Heliodorus*. Cambridge Philological Association. Supplementary Volume 21. Cambridge.
- Ingarden, R. 1960. *Das literarische Kunstwerk*. Tübingen.
- Jakobson, R. 1987. *Language in Literature*. Ed. by K. Pomorska and S. Rudy. Cambridge, Mass.
- James, L., ed. 1997. *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium*. London and New York.
- James, L., and Webb, R. 1991. "'To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places:' Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium." *Art History* 14: 1–17.
- Jauss, H. R., ed. 1968. *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste. Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen*. Munich.
- Jauss, H. R. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Brighton, Minnesota.
- Jeffreys, E. 1978. "The Judgement of Paris in Later Byzantine Literature." *Byzantion* 48: 112–131. Reprinted in Jeffreys & Jeffreys (1983) as no. 8.
- Jeffreys, E. 1980. "The Comnenian Background to the *Romans d'Antiquité*." *Byzantion* 50: 455–486. Reprinted in Jeffreys & Jeffreys (1983) as no. 10.
- Jeffreys, E. 1982. "The Sevastokratorissa Eirene as Literary Patroness: the Monk Iakovos." *JÖB* 32: 63–71.
- Jeffreys, E. 1998. "The Novels of Mid-Twelfth Century Constantinople. The Literary and Social Context." In I. Ševčenko and I. Hutter (eds.), *ΑΕΤΟΣ. Studies in honour of Cyril Mango*: 191–199. Stuttgart and Leipzig 1998.
- Jeffreys, E. 2000. "A Date for Rhodante and Dosikles?" In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 127–136.
- Jeffreys, E., and M. 1983. *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium*. Variorum Reprints. London.
- Jeffreys, M. 1976. "The Astrological Prologue of Digenis Akritas." *Byz* 46: 375–397. Reprinted in Jeffreys & Jeffreys (1983) as no. 6.
- Jenkins, R. J. H. 1963. "The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature." *DOP* 17: 38–52.
- Johne, R. 1996. "Women in the Ancient Novel." In Schmeling (1996) 151–207.

- Jouanno, C. 1992. "Les barbares dans le roman byzantin du XIIe siècle. Fonction d'un topos." *Byz* 62: 264–300.
- Jouanno, C. 1994. "Reflexions sur le rôle du regard dans le roman grec et byzantin." *Prisma* 10.2: 149–164.
- Jouanno, C. 2000. "Discourse of the Body in Prodomos, Eugenianos and Macrembolites." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 81–93.
- Kaimio, M. 1995. "How to Manage in the Male World: The Strategies of the Heroine in Chariton's Novel." *Acta antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 36: 119–132.
- Kambylis, A. 1976. See Editions, Symeon the New Theologian.
- Kazhdan, A. 1967. "Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos." *JÖB* 16: 101–117.
- Kazhdan, A. 1983. "Certain Traits of Imperial Propaganda in the Byzantine Empire from the Eighth to the Fifteenth Centuries." In G. Makdisi (ed.), *Prédication et propagande au Moyen Age. Islam, Byzance, Occident*: 13–27. Penn - Paris - Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia 3. Paris 1983.
- Kazhdan, A. 1995. "Innovation in Byzantium." In Littlewood (1995) 1–14.
- Kazhdan, A. 1999. *A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)*. In collaboration with L. F. Sherry and C. Angelidi. Athens.
- Kazhdan, A., and Constable, G. 1982. *People and Power in Byzantium*. Washington D.C.
- Kazhdan, A., and Epstein, A. W. 1985. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Kazhdan, A., and Franklin, S. 1984. *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Cambridge and Paris.
- Kennedy, G. 1980. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, N.C.
- Kennedy, G. 1981. "The Classical Tradition in Rhetoric." In Mullett & Scott, (1981) 20–34.
- Kennedy, G. 1983. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton, N. J.
- Kittay, J., ed. 1980. *Towards a Theory of Description*. Yale French Studies 61. New Haven.
- Klagge, J. C., and Smith, N. D., eds. 1992. *Methods of Interpreting Plato and his Dialogues*. Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 1992, Supplementary Volume. Oxford.
- Klotz, V., ed. 1965. *Zur Poetik des Romans*. Darmstadt.
- Knös, B. 1962. "Qui est l'auteur de Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe?" *Hellenika* 17: 247–295.
- Kolovou, F. 1998. "Die Quellenidentifizierung als Hilfsmittel zur Textkonstitution der Briefe des Michael Choniates." In I. Vassis, G. S. Henrich, and D. R. Reinsch (eds.), *Lesarten. Festschrift für Athanasios Kambylis zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern, Kollegen und Freunden*: 129–136. Berlin 1998.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*. Princeton, N. J.
- Konstan, D. 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge.
- Kristeva, J. 1969. *Séméiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris.
- Krumbacher, K. 1897<sup>2</sup>. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9.1. First published 1891. Munich.
- Kustas, G. 1970. "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric." *Viator* 1: 55–73.
- Kustas, G. 1973. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*. 'Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων 17. Thessalonica.
- Kustas, G. 1995. "Rhetoric and the Holy Spirit." In Littlewood (1995) 29–37.
- Kytzler, 1996. "Xenophon of Ephesus." In Schmeling (1996) 336–359.



- Laiou, A. E. 1981. "The Role of Women in Byzantine Society." *JÖB* 31: 233–260.
- Laiou, A. E. 1985. "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women." *ByzF* 9: 59–102.
- Laiou, A. E. 1992. *Mariage, amour et parenté à Byzance aux XIe-XIIIe siècles*. Travaux et mémoires du centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Collège de France. Monographies 7. Paris.
- Laiou, A. E., ed. 1993. *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Society*. Washington D.C.
- Lamb (1952) = Plato, vol. IV. *Laches, Protagoras, Meno, Euthydemus*. English translation by W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library. London.
- Lampsidis, O. 1991. "Der vollständige Text der 'Εκφρασις γῆς des Konstantinos Manasses." *JÖB* 41: 189–205.
- Lampsidis, O., ed. 1996. *Constantini Manassis breviarium chronicum*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 36/1. Athens.
- Laourdas, B, and Westerink, L. G. 1983. *See* Editions, Photios.
- Laplace, M. 1991. "Achille Tatius, Leucippé et Clitophon: des fables au roman de formation." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4: 35–56.
- Lauxtermann, M. 1998. "Three Biographical Notes." *BZ* 91: 391–405.
- Lemerle, P. 1971. *Le premier humanisme byzantin*. Paris.
- Lemerle, P. 1977. *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin*. Paris.
- Leone, P. A. M. 1968. *See* Editions, John Tzetzes.
- Létoublon, F. 1993. *Les lieux communs du roman. Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour*. Leiden.
- Lévêque, P. 1959. *Aurea Catena Homeri. Une étude sur l'allégorie greque*. Paris.
- Littlewood, A. R. 1972. *See* Editions, John Geometres.
- Littlewood, A. R. 1974. "The Symbolism of the Apple in Byzantine Literature." *JÖB* 23: 33–59.
- Littlewood, A. R. 1979. "Romantic Paradises: The Rôle of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance." *BMGS* 5: 95–114.
- Littlewood, A. R. 1985. *See* Editions, Michael Psellos.
- Littlewood, A. R., ed. 1995. *Originality in Byzantine Literature, Art and Music. A Collection of Essays*. Oxbow Monograph 50. Oxford.
- Littlewood, A. R. 1997. "Garden of the Palaces." In Maguire (1997) 3–38.
- Ljubarskij, J., et al. 1998. SO Debate. "Quellenforschung and/or Literary Criticism: Narrative Structures in Byzantine Historical Writings." *Symbolae Osloenses* 73: 5–73.
- Lodge, D. 1976. "The Language of Modernist Fiction: Metaphor and Metonymy." In M. Bradbury and J. McFarlane (eds.), *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature 1890–1930*: 481–496. London 1976.
- Lotman, J. 1977. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Ann Arbor. First published in Russian 1971.
- Lowe, N. J. 2000. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge.
- MacAlister, S. 1990. "Aristotle on the Dream: a Twelfth-Century Romance Revival." *Byz* 60: 195–212.
- MacAlister, S. 1991. "Byzantine Twelfth-Century Romances: a Relative Chronology." *BMGS* 15: 175–210.
- MacAlister, S. 1994a. "Byzantine Developements." In Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 275–287.

- MacAlister, S. 1994b. "Ancient and Contemporary in Byzantine Novels." In Tatum (1994) 308–322.
- MacAlister, S. 1996. *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*. London and New York.
- Macrides, R. & Magdalino, P. 1992. "The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism." In P. Magdalino (ed.), *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*: 117–156. London 1992.
- Magdalino, P. 1992. "Eros the King and the King of Amours: Some Observations on *Hysmine and Hysminias*." *DOP* 46: 197–204.
- Magdalino, P. 1993. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1142–1180*. Cambridge.
- Magdalino, P., and Nelson, R. 1982. "The Emperor in Byzantine Art of the Twelfth Century." *ByzF* 8: 123–183.
- Maguire, H. 1981a. *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium*. Princeton, N. J.
- Maguire, H. 1981b. "The Classical Tradition in the Byzantine Ekphrasis." In Mullett & Scott (1981) 94–102.
- Maguire, H. 1990. "A Description of the Aretai Palace and its Garden." *Journal of Garden History* 10: 209–213. Reprinted in Maguire (1998) as no. 16.
- Maguire, H. 1994. "Imperial Gardens and the Rhetoric of Renewal. In P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries*: 181–197. Aldershot 1994. Reprinted in Maguire (1998) as no. 18.
- Maguire, H., ed. 1997. *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*. Washington D.C.
- Maguire, H. 1998. *Rhetoric, Nature and Magic in Byzantine Art*. Variorum Reprints. Aldershot.
- Mango, C. 1975. "Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror." An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 21 May 1974. Oxford. Reprinted in Mango (1984) as no. 2.
- Mango, C. 1980. *Byzantium. The Empire of New Rome*. London.
- Mango, C. 1981. "Discontinuity with the Classical Past in Byzantium." In Mullett & Scott (1981) 48–57. Reprinted in Mango (1984) as no. 3.
- Mango, C. 1984. *Byzantium and its Image. History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and its Heritage*. Variorum Reprints. London.
- Martini, S. C. E. 1896. "A proposito d'una poesia inedita di Manuel File," *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo*, Ser. 2, 29: 465–9. Milan.
- Mavrogordato, J., ed. 1956. *Digenes Akrites, edited with an introduction, translation and commentary*. Oxford.
- Mazal, O., ed. 1967. *Der Roman des Konstantinos Manasses. Überlieferung, Rekonstruktion, Textausgabe der Fragmente*. Vienna.
- McKeon, R. 1952. "Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity." In R. S. Crane (ed.), *Critics and Criticism. Ancient and Modern*: 147–175. Chicago 1952. First published in *Modern Philology* 34,1: 1–35.
- Mendilow, A. A. 1952. *Time and the Novel*. London and New York.
- Merkelbach, R. 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. Munich.
- Meschini, A. 1973/74. "Sugli gnomologi Bizantini di Euripide." *Helikon* 13/14: 349–362.
- Meunier, F. 1991. *Eumathios. Les Amours Homonymes. Roman*. Paris.
- Meunier, F. 1998. "Le voyage imaginaire dans le roman byzantin du XIIème siècle." *Byz* 68: 72–90.
- Middleton, A. 1992. "Medieval Studies." In S. Greenblatt and G. Gunn (eds.), *Rethinking the Boundaries. The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*: 12–40. New York 1992.



- Millan, F. 1964. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
- Miner (1993) = *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*: 38–40. Ed. by A. Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan. Princeton, N. J.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. 1980. "Spatial Form in Literature: Toward a General Theory." *Critical Inquiry* 6: 539–565.
- Mitsi, E. and Agapitos, P. A., 1990/91. "Εἰκὼν καὶ λόγος. Ἡ περιγραφὴ ἔργων τέχνης στὴ βυζαντινὴ γραμματεία." *Annales d'Esthétique* 29–30: 109–126.
- Morgan, J. R. 1996. "Heliodoros." In Schmeling (1996) 417–456.
- Morgan, J. R. 1998. "Narrative Doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*." In Hunter (1998) 60–78.
- Morgan, J. R., and Stoneman, R., eds. 1994. *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*. London.
- Morse, R. 1991. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages. Rhetoric, Presentation and Reality*. Cambridge.
- Most, G. 1989. "The Stranger's Stratagem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109: 114–133.
- Müller, G. 1968. *Morphologische Poetik. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. In Verbindung mit H. Egner hrsg. von E. Müller. Tübingen.
- Mullett, M. 1984. "Aristocracy and Patronage in the Literary Circles of Comnenian Constantinople." In M. Angold (ed.), *The Byzantine Aristocracy: IX to XIII Centuries* (BAR International Series 221): 173–197. Oxford 1984.
- Mullett, M. 1990. "Dancing with Deconstructionists in the Garden of the Muses: New Literary History vs.?" *BMGS* 14: 258–275.
- Mullett, M. 1992. "The Madness of Genre." *DOP* 46: 233–243.
- Mullett, M. 1995. "Originality in the Byzantine Letter: The Case of Exile." In Littlewood (1995) 39–58.
- Mullett, M. 1997. *Theophylact of Ochrid. Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*. Aldershot.
- Mullett, M., and Scott, R., eds. 1981. *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition. University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies 1979*. Birmingham.
- Nicholson, G. 2000. "The Discourses of the *Phaedrus*." In J. Russon and J. Sallis (eds.), *Retracing the Platonic Text*: 19–31. Evanston, Illinois 2000.
- Nilsson, I. 1998. "Phantasia: a Wise and Subtle Artist. Visualizing a Twelfth-Century Ekphrasis." In E. Piltz and P. Åström (eds.), *Kairos. Studies in Art History and Literature in Honour of Professor Gunilla Åkerström-Hougen*: 50–65. Jonsered 1998.
- Nilsson, I. 2000. "Spatial Time and Temporal Space: Aspects of Narrativity in Makrembolites." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000) 94–108.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1950. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I. Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die Griechische Weltherrschaft*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft V 2.1. Munich.
- Nimis, S. 1998. "Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel." *Arethusa* 31: 99–122.
- Nuttall, A. D. 1992. *Openings. Narrative Beginnings from the Epic to the Novel*. Oxford.
- Odorico, P. 1997. "L'amour à Byzance. Un sujet de rhétorique?" *Europe: revue littéraire mensuelle* 75, no. 822: 34–46.
- Orsini, P., ed. 1968. *Musée. Héro et Léandre*. Paris.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. 1980. *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*. Berlin.

- Palm, J. 1965/66. "Bemerkungen zur Ekphrase in der griechischen Literatur." *Kungliga humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala. Årsbok* 1965–66: 108–211. Stockholm.
- Paulsen, T. 1993. "Wunschträume und Ängste. Kaiserzeitliche Gesellschaft und Erotik im Spiegel des antiken Liebesromans." In Binder & Effe (1993) 45–62.
- Pecoraro, V. 1982. "La nascita del romanzo moderno nell'Europa del XII secolo. Le sue origini orientali e la mediazione di Bisanzio all'occidente." *JÖB* 32, 3: 307–319.
- Perkins, J. 1994a. "Representation in Greek Saints' Lives." In Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 255–271.
- Perkins, J. 1994b. "The Social World of the *Acts of Peter*." In Tatum (1994) 296–307.
- Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*. Berkeley.
- Pervo, R. 1994. "Early Christian Fiction." In Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 239–254.
- Pervo, R. 1996. "The Ancient Novel Becomes Christian." In Schmeling (1996) 685–711.
- Petta, M. 1993. "Ἡ ἀγνωστο βυζαντινὸ ἐρωτικὸ ποίημα τοῦ 12ου αἰῶνα." In N. M. Panayiotakes (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca: atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale "Neograeca Medii Aevi" (Venezia, 7–10 Novembre 1991)*, vol 2: 77–88. Venice 1993.
- Pichard, M., ed. 1956. *Le Roman de Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe*. Paris.
- Picone, M., and Zimmermann, B., eds. 1997. *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*. Basel.
- Pignani, A. 1983. See Editions, Nikephoros Basilakes.
- Plepelits, K. 1980. *Achilleus Tatius. Leukippe und Kleitophon. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert*. Stuttgart.
- Plepelits, K. 1989. *Eustathios Makrembolites. Hysmine und Hysminias. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert*. Stuttgart.
- Plepelits, K. 1996. "Achilles Tatius." In Schmeling (1996) 387–416.
- Pletcher, J. A. 1998. "Euripides in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* 7–8." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9: 17–27.
- Polemis, D. I. 1994. "Κριτικὲς καὶ ἐρμηνευτικὲς παρατηρήσεις στὲ βυζαντινὰ καὶ μεταβυζαντινὰ ποιήματα." *Hellenika* 44: 359–364.
- Poljakova, S. V. 1969. "K voprosu o datirovke romana Jeumati'ja Makremvolita." *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 30: 113–123.
- Poljakova, S. V. 1971. "O xronologičeskoj posledovatel'nosti romanov Jeumati'ja Makremvolita i Feodora Prodroma." *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 32: 104–108.
- Poljakova, S. V. 1976. "K voprosu o vizantino-francuzskix literaturnyx sv'az'ax." *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 37: 114–122.
- Poljakova, S. V. 1979. *Iz istorii vizantijskogo romana*. Moscow.
- Rabkin, E. S. 1981. "Spatial Form and Plot." In Smitten & Daghistany (1981) 79–99.
- Rattenbury, R. M. 1926. "Chastity and Chastity Ordeals in the Ancient Greek Romance." *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society. Literary and Historical Section* 1: 59–71.
- Rattenbury, R. M. 1933. "Traces of Lost Greek Romances." In J. U. Powell (ed.), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, III: 211–257. Oxford 1933.
- Reardon, B. P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* Paris.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 1977. *Erotica Antiqua: Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*. Bangor.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley.
- Reardon, B. P. 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton.



- Reardon, B. P. 1994. "Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative." In Morgan & Stoneman (1994) 80–96.
- Reardon, B. P. 1996. "Chariton." In Schmeling (1996) 311–355.
- Reinsch, D. R. 1998. "Die Zitate in der *Alexias* Anna Komnenes." *Σύμμεκτα* 12: 63–73.
- Rey, A.-L. 1996. "Un ingrédient du roman: les scènes de repas chez Eustathios Makrembolitis." *Cahiers de la faculté des lettres* (Université de Genève): 40–44.
- Riffaterre, M. 1979. "La Syllepse intertextuelle." *Poétique* 40.
- Riffaterre, M. 1980a. "La trace de l'intertexte." *La Pensée*, October 1980.
- Riffaterre, M. 1980b. "Descriptive Imagery." In Kittay (1980) 107–125.
- Riffaterre, M. 1983. *Text Production*. New York.
- Riffaterre, M. 1990. "Theoretical vs. Historical Approaches to Genre." In J. Tatum and G. M. Vernazza (eds.), *The Ancient Novel. Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives* (Proceedings of ICAN 2): 72–78. Hanover, New Hampshire 1990.
- Ringrose, K. M. 1994. "Living in the Shadows: Eunuchs and Gender in Byzantium." In G. Herdt (ed.), *Third Sex, Third Gender. Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*: 85–109. New York 1994.
- Roberts, D., Dunn, F., and Fowler, D., eds. 1997. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton, N. J.
- Rohde, E. 1914<sup>3</sup>. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig. First published 1876.
- Roilos, P. 2000. "Amphoteroglossia: The Role of Rhetoric in the Medieval Greek Learned Novel." In Agapitos & Reinsch (2000): 109–126.
- Romano, R., ed. 1974. *Timarion. Pseudo-Luciano, Timarione*. Naples.
- Rosenqvist, J. O. 1986. See Editions, *Life of St Irene of Chrysobalanton*.
- Rouché, C. 1988. "Byzantine Writers and Readers: Storytelling in the Eleventh Century." In Beaton (1988) 123–133.
- Rousset, J. 1981. *Leurs yeux se rencontrèrent. La scène de première vue dans le roman*. Paris.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 1982. *La estructura de la novela griega*. Salamanca.
- Russell, D. A. 1972. *Plutarch*. London.
- Russell, D. A., ed. 1990. *Antonine Literature*. Oxford.
- Rydén, L. 1985. "The Bride-Shows at the Byzantine Court—History or Fiction?" *Eranos*: 175–191.
- Sargologos, E. 1964. See Editions, *Kataskepenos*.
- Savran, G. W. 1988. *Telling and Retelling. Quotation in Biblical Literature*. Indiana studies in biblical literature. Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Schaff, P., ed. 1977. *A select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids.
- Schafi, M., ed. 1967. *Wāmiq-o-Adhrā of 'Unsurī*. Lahore.
- Schissel, O. 1942. "Der byzantinische Garten. Seine Darstellung im gleichzeitigen Romane." *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse*. Vol. 221.2: 21–28. Vienna.
- Schmeling, G. 1980. *Xenophon of Ephesus*. Boston.
- Schmeling, G., ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden.
- Schmid (1909) = *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll (Stuttgart, 1894–), vol. 6: 1075–1077.
- Scholes, R., and Kellogg, R. 1966. *The Nature of Narrative*. Oxford.
- Schouler, B. 1995. "La définition de la rhétorique dans l'enseignement byzantin." *Byz* 65: 136–175.

- Schreiner, P. 1989. "Renaissance in Byzanz?" In W. Erzgräber (ed.), *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike in Mittelalter*: 389–390. Sigmaringen 1989.
- Sedelmeyer, D. 1959. "Studien zu Achilleus Tatios." *Wiener Studien* 72: 113–143.
- Segal, C. 1984. "The Trials at the End of Achilles Tatius' Clitophon and Leucippe: Doublets and Complementaries." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 2: 83–91.
- Ševčenko, I. 1984. "The Palaeologan Renaissance." In Treadgold (1984) 144–176.
- Shklovskii, V. B. 1966. "Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and the Theory of the Novel." In L. Lemon and M. Reis (eds.), *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*: 25–60. Lincoln 1966. First published in Russian 1921.
- Sideras, A. 1994. *Die byzantinischen Grabreden: Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung*. 142 *Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend*. Vienna.
- Smith, O. L. 1980. "Fra 'tyche' til 'Eros'. Den hellenistiske roman i Byzans." *Museum Tusculanum* 40–43: 541–551.
- Smith, O. L., ed. 1999. *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version*. Introduction, critical edition and commentary by O. L. Smith†. Edited and prepared for publication by P. A. Agapitos and K. Hult. Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 21. Vienna.
- Smitten, J. R., and Daghistany, A., eds. 1981. *Spatial Form in Narrative*. Ithaca, N. Y.
- Speck, P. 1974. *Die kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel*. Munich.
- Stark, J. O. 1974. *The Literature of Exhaustion*. Durham, N.C.
- Stephens, S. 1994. "Who Read Ancient Novels?" In Tatum (1994) 405–418.
- Stephens, S. 1996. "Fragments of Lost Novels." In Schmeling (1996) 656–683.
- Stephens, S., and Winkler, J., eds. 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Princeton, N. J.
- Stern, H. 1955. "Poésies et représentations Carolingiennes et Byzantines des mois." *Revue Archéologique* 45: 141–186.
- Strzygowsky, J. 1888. "Die Monatcyklen der byzantinischen Kunst." *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 11: 23–46.
- Talbot Rice, D. 1963. *Art of the Byzantine Era*. London.
- Tatum, J., ed. 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore.
- Tiftixoglu, V. 1974. "Digenes, das 'Sophrosyne'-Gedicht des Meliteniotes und der byzantinische Fünfzehnsilber," *BZ* 67: 1–63.
- Tinnefeld, F. 1973. "'Freundschaft' in den Briefen des Michael Psellos." *JÖB* 22: 151–168.
- Tobin, P. D. 1978. *Time and the Novel. The Genealogical Imperative*. Princeton, N. J.
- Tonnet, H. 1992. "Sensualité et érotisme dans le roman grec des origines à la guerre de 14." *Cahiers Balkaniques* 18: 41–58.
- Tonnet, H. 1996. *Histoire du roman grec des origines à 1960*. Paris.
- Tougher, S. F. 1997. "Byzantine Eunuchs: An Overview, with Special Reference to their Creation." In James (1997) 168–184.
- Trapp, E., ed. 1971. *Digenes Akrites. Synoptische Ausgabe der ältesten Versionen*. Vienna.
- Trapp, M. B. 1990. "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Literature." In Russell (1990) 141–173.
- Treadgold, W. E. 1979. "The Bride-Shows of the Byzantine Emperors." *Byz* 49: 395–413.
- Treadgold, W. E. ed. 1984. *Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*.
- Troianos, S. 1989. "Kirchliche und weltliche Rechtsquellen zur Homosexualität in Byzanz." *JÖB* 39: 29–48.



- Turyn, A. 1943. *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*. Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. New York.
- Turyn, A. 1952. *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 36. Urbana.
- Turyn, A. 1957. *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 43. Urbana.
- Utas, B. 1984/1986. "Did 'Adhrā remain a virgin?" *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35: 429–441.
- Van Erp Taalman Kip, M. 1994. "Intertextuality and Theocritus 13." In De Jong & Sullivan (1994) 153–169.
- Vidan, I. 1981. "Time Sequence in Spatial Fiction." In Smitten & Daghistany (1981) 131–157. Reprinted in Hoffmann & Murphy (1988) 435–456.
- Vilborg, E., ed. 1955. *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 1. Göteborg.
- Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 15. Göteborg.
- Vlastos, G. 1983. "The Socratic Elenchus." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 1: 27–58.
- Vryonis, S. 1957. "The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059)." *DOP* 11: 263–277.
- Webster, J. C. 1938. *The Labours of the Months in Antique and Mediaeval Art to the End of the Twelfth Century*. Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, 4. Evanston and Chicago. Reprinted 1970, New York.
- Wehrhahn-Stauch (1968) = *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* 1: 503–504. Ed. by E. Kirschbaum & W. Brauntels. Rome, Freiburg, Basle, Vienna 1968–1976.
- Weitzmann, K. 1951. *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art*. Studies in Manuscript Illumination 4. Princeton, N. J.
- Wellek, R. 1963. "The Concept of Realism in Literary Scholarship." *Neophilologus* 40 (1960) 1–20.
- Wellek, R., and Warren, A. 1963<sup>3</sup>. *Theory of Literature. A Seminal Study of the Nature and Function of Literature in All its Contexts*. London. First published 1949.
- Wengst, K. 1993. "Fast eine Fehlanzeige: Sexualität und Erotik im Neuen Testament." In Binder & Effe (1993) 93–104.
- West, M. L., ed. 1978. *Hesiod. Works & Days*. Oxford.
- Westerink, L. G. 1992. See Editions, Michael Psellos.
- Wiersma, S. 1990. "The Ancient Greek Novel and its Heroines: a Female Paradox." *Mnemosyne* 43: 109–123.
- Wilcken, U. 1901. "Eine neue Roman-Handschrift." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 1: 227–272.
- Wilson, N. G. 1978. "A Byzantine Miscellany: ms. Barocci 131 described." *JÖB* 27: 157–179.
- Wilson, N. G. 1994. *Photius. The Bibliotheca. A Selection translated with notes*. London.
- Wilson, N. G. 1996<sup>2</sup>. *Scholars of Byzantium*. First published 1983. London.
- Winkler, J. J. 1994. "The Invention of Romance." In Tatum (1994) 23–38.
- Zeitlin, F. 1990. "The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." In D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before*

- Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*: 417–464. Princeton, N. J. 1990. Also published in an abbreviated and revised version as “Gardens of Desire in Longus’ *Daphnis & Chloe*: Nature, Art and Imitation” in Tatum (1994) 148–170.
- Zimmermann, B. 1997. “Die Symphonie der Texte. Zur Intertextualität im griechischen Liebesroman.” In Picone & Zimmermann (1997) 3–13.
- Zimmermann, M., Panayotakis, S., and Keulen, W. H., eds. 2000. *The Ancient Novel in Context* (Abstracts of the papers to be read at ICAN 3). Groningen.



# Index locorum

An asterisk (\*) indicates a page or a note where a passage is quoted.

## A. Makrembolites and Achilles Tatius

### Eumathios Makrembolites, *Hysmine & Hysminias*

1.1 85; 1.1.1 52, 140n.344, 179; 1.1.1–1.2.1 51\*, 74; 1.1.2 114, 179; 1.1.2–1.2 56; 1.1–2 193n.135; 1.2.1 52, 57n.41, 69, 114, 117n.253; 1.2.1–2 56\*; 1.2.2 89\*; 1.3 57, 62; 1.3.1 61n.48, 83\*, 87, 89, 114; 1.3.1–2 58, 69; 1.3.2 182\*; 1.3.2–3 58\*; 1.3.3 53; 1.4 98; 1.4.1 99\*, 114–115\*, 117n.254, 209n.213; 1.4.1–3 99; 1.4.2 89\*; 1.4.3 89, 89n.135, 100, 117n.254, 211\*, 263, 271; 1.4.3–4 86\*, 209\*; 1.4.4 211, 263; 1.4.6 194; 1.4–6 85, 98, 193n.135; 1.5 98, 101; 1.5.7 130n.298, 269\*; 1.5.8 269\*; 1.6 98; 1.6.2 130n.298, 209\*, 228n.284; 1.7 117n.253; 1.7.1 98\*, 99, 153n.409; 1.7.2 88\*, 161\*; 1.7–11 60, 99, 107; 1.8.1 153\*; 1.8.1–2 101; 1.8.3 71\*, 88\*; 1.8.3–4 254\*; 1.8.3–9 71; 1.8.4 88\*, 99, 100n.182, 153\*; 1.8–11 59; 1.9.1 53, 71\*, 153n.409, 156\*, 280n.105; 1.9.2–3 71; 1.9.3 106; 1.9.4 207n.204; 1.10.1 161\*, 272\*; 1.10.3 162n.447, 258; 1.11.3 71, 263\*, 280n.105; 1.12 59, 281; 1.12.3 281n.110\*, 281n.112; 1.12.3–4 71; 1.13.1 96\*, 271\*, 273n.66; 1.13.1–14.5 94; 1.13.2 88\*, 95\*; 1.13.3 270\*, 273n.67; 1.14 63n.52, 254n.391; 1.14.1 53n.26, 157; 1.14.1–3 64; 1.14.2 138n.332; 1.14.4–5 123\*, 128n.287, 147, 148; 1.14.5 72, 118n.256, 162n.450, 257n.409, 266\*, 266n.26, 273\*

2.1–11 99; 2.1.2 98\*, 130\*; 2.2.1–2 274n.73\*; 2.2.2 130n.299, 132n.304; 2.2.3 86, 87, 132n.304, 273\*; 2.2.4 279n.99\*; 2.2.5 213n.236; 2.2.6 130n.299; 2.2–5 86, 131, 251n.377; 2.2–9 55, 85, 86, 98, 193n.135; 2.2–10 124; 2.3 132n.304; 2.3.3

77n.85, 134n.315; 2.4.2 114n.248, 130n.299; 2.4.5 265, 265n.21\*, 271\*, 277n.85, 280n.105; 2.5.1 130n.299, 280n.105; 2.6 86, 131; 2.6.1 247n.352; 2.6.2–7 83, 86; 2.6.3 132n.304, 213n.236, 213n.238\*; 2.6.4 130n.299; 2.6.5 130n.299; 2.6.6 86, 106, 114n.248, 128n.287, 130\*, 131; 2.7 103\*; 2.7.1 265n.18; 2.7.2 268n.40; 2.7.3 118n.256, 265; 2.7.4 212; 2.7.5–2.8 86, 87, 128n.287; 2.7–9 86; 2.7–11 35n.146; 2.8 148, 148n.388; 2.8.1 104\*, 130\*, 132, 183n.82, 247n.352; 2.8.2 130–131\*; 2.9 112; 2.9–10 184n.87, 184n.89; 2.10.2–3 106; 2.10.4 131\*; 2.10.5 86, 105\*; 2.10–11 86; 2.11 112, 124\*, 162n.446; 2.11.3 65, 105, 128n.287, 205n.192, 207n.204, 267n.38; 2.12.2 53n.26, 71\*, 156\*, 258; 2.12–13 60, 71, 99, 107; 2.13 83n.108; 2.13.1 130n.298; 2.13.2 53n.26, 124\*, 156–7\*; 2.13.3 72\*, 96, 234n.296, 272; 2.14 254n.391; 2.14.1 71, 96; 2.14.2 53n.26, 63n.52, 157; 2.14.2–3 64, 83; 2.14.3 53n.26, 157; 2.14.4 113n.239, 152n.404, 254\*; 2.14.4–5 204n.186; 2.14.4–6 72, 105, 106, 124\*, 162n.446, 257; 2.14.6 107, 128n.287, 207n.204, 233\*, 268n.40, 273\*

3.1 35n.146, 55, 72, 73, 103, 105–106\*, 125, 159, 160, 203; 3.1.3 114, 115, 131; 3.1.4 66n.59, 112, 113, 114, 267n.38; 3.1.5 114; 3.1.6 66\*, 68, 112, 114n.247; 3.1–2 194n.142, 207n.204; 3.1–7 160; 3.2.1 94\*; 3.2.3–4 282n.114; 3.2.3–7 107n.214, 112\*, 151; 3.2.4–6 280n.105; 3.2.6 118n.256; 3.2.7 116; 3.3 125; 3.3.1 108n.216, 113\*, 113n.240; 3.3.2 64, 107\*; 3.3.2–4 125\*, 162n.446; 3.3.3 107, 125, 267n.39, 270\*, 270n.52; 3.4 107,

(Hysmine & Hysminias, cont.)

199n.165; 3.4.1 94\*, 153n.409, 195\*; 3.4.2-3.7 55, 125; 3.4.2-7 70\*; 3.4.7 72\*, 96\*, 153n.409; 3.5 60, 107, 228; 3.5.1-6 70, 72; 3.5.2 153n.409; 3.5.3 107; 3.5.7 107; 3.5-7 107, 194n.142, 195; 3.6 85, 101, 107n.214, 193n.135, 194, 195; 3.6.2 199, 199n.163; 3.6.3 130n.298, 252n.381\*; 3.6.4 115n.250, 252n.379\*, 252n.380\*; 3.7 107n.214, 234n.297; 3.7.1-5 113n.239, 151; 3.7.3 199\*, 199n.162; 3.7.4 280\*; 3.7.6 153n.409; 3.7.6-7 196, 236n.302; 3.7.7 153n.409, 196\*; 3.8.2 125, 131\*; 3.8.3 113\*, 129, 134n.314; 3.8-9 99; 3.9 129n.291, 162n.449; 3.9.1 268n.40; 3.9.1-2 125-126\*; 3.9.3 114, 153n.409; 3.9.4 153n.409; 3.9.5-6 126\*, 152, 257n.408; 3.9.6 114, 267n.39, 271n.55; 3.9.7 114; 3.10.2 114; 3.10.5 114\*, 126; 3.10-4.2 60, 99

4.1 254; 4.1.1 228n.284; 4.1.1-2 71; 4.1.3 71, 99\*, 183n.82, 199n.164; 4.2.2 129; 4.2.3 153n.409, 271n.55, 277n.84; 4.3 60, 99, 160, 254; 4.3.2-3 254; 4.3.3 126, 160\*, 255, 266; 4.3.4 126, 255n.396; 4.4.1 94\*; 4.4.1-2 162n.447, 162n.450, 258; 4.4.3 199\*, 199n.163, 252n.383; 4.4.3-4.20 99; 4.5.2 134n.313; 4.5.3 134n.313; 4.5-16 55, 85, 86, 98, 126, 193n.135; 4.5-18 129; 4.6.1 134n.313; 4.6.2 134n.313; 4.7.1 134n.313; 4.7.3 134n.313; 4.8.1 134n.313; 4.8.2 134n.313; 4.8.3 134n.313; 4.9.2 271n.55, 271n.56\*, 277n.84, 277n.85; 4.10.1 134n.313; 4.10.2 134n.313; 4.11.1 134n.313; 4.11.3 134n.313; 4.12.3 134n.313; 4.13.1 134n.313; 4.13.3 77n.85, 134n.313, 134n.314, 134n.315; 4.14.1 134n.313; 4.14.3 134n.313; 4.15.1 134n.313, 262n.6, 267n.39, 268n.44, 270n.51; 4.15.2 134n.313; 4.16.1 134n.313; 4.17.2 86, 126\*, 199n.163, 200n.168, 240\*, 252n.383; 4.18 83, 127; 4.18.1 183n.82; 4.18.2-13 86; 4.18.10 271n.55, 277n.84; 4.18.13 272\*, 277n.85; 4.19 82\*; 4.19.1 183n.82; 4.19.2 83, 88, 272, 234n.296, 282n.114; 4.20 86, 127\*, 129, 130,

133n.309, 134, 240n.315; 4.20.2 134; 4.20.3 77n.85, 133n.309, 134; 4.20.5 129n.291; 4.21.1-2 203n.183, 208n.207; 4.21.2 135n.318; 4.21.3 267n.38; 4.21.3-4 72\*; 4.21-23 60, 99; 4.22 255; 4.22.1 255n.395\*; 4.22.2 255\*; 4.22.3 115\*, 255n.396\*; 4.23.2 265n.20; 4.24.4 267n.38; 4.25 72-73\*, 199n.165; 4.25.2 255n.396

5.1 73, 108, 194n.142; 5.1-5.4.1 55, 60; 5.1.1 108; 5.1.2 108; 5.1.3 108, 264\*; 5.1.4 264-265\*; 5.2 66\*, 69, 108, 194n.142; 5.3.3-4.1 225-226\*; 5.3.3-5.4 108, 152; 5.3.4 215n.244, 268n.41; 5.3.5 114n.247, 283n.124; 5.3.6 283n.123; 5.3.8 267n.38, 283n.124, 284n.128; 5.3-4 161, 194n.142; 5.4.3 153n.409; 5.5 162n.449; 5.5.1 267n.38, 284n.130; 5.5.1-2 64, 83; 5.5.3-4 108\*; 5.5.4 110\*, 162n.446, 285n.132; 5.6.1 62n.49\*, 129; 5.6.2-3 116; 5.6.2-4 99; 5.6.3 73\*, 109; 5.6-7 60-61\*; 5.7 69; 5.7.1 62n.49; 5.7.2 83n.110, 265n.19; 5.8 62, 69; 5.8.2 62\*, 134n.314; 5.9.3 100n.186; 5.9.3-4 228\*, 231; 5.9.3-5.12 60; 5.9-11 81; 5.10.3 156n.424, 231, 268n.40; 5.10.3-5 229\*; 5.10.3-5.11 71; 5.10-12 162n.447, 258; 5.11.2-6 81-82\*; 5.11.4 71, 229\*, 153n.409; 5.11.5 153n.409; 5.11.6 199n.163, 200n.168; 5.11-12 229; 5.12 230; 5.12.1 114n.244; 5.12.3 71; 5.12.4 118n.256; 5.13.2 153n.409, 230\*; 5.14 199n.165; 5.14.2-3 71; 5.14.5 280n.105; 5.15 223; 5.15.1 62, 62n.51\*; 5.15-5.20 62; 5.16 73, 108; 5.16.1 118n.256; 5.17.1-2 115\*; 5.18.1 114n.244, 135n.319, 134\*; 5.18.2 114n.244, 116n.252; 5.20.1 114n.244, 255n.396; 5.20.2 114n.244, 118n.256, 153n.409

6.1.2-6.4 60; 6.3.1 153n.409; 6.3.2 278n.95\*; 6.5.2 62, 62n.51; 6.7.1 267n.38; 6.8.1 267n.38; 6.8.2 255n.396; 6.8.3 99\*, 116, 252n.382; 6.10 66, 223; 6.10.2 223\*; 6.10.3-6 223; 6.10.3-6.11 161; 6.10.4 267n.38; 6.10.6 278\*; 6.10-11 63; 6.11.2 278\*; 6.11.3 223; 6.12 64, 83; 6.13 162n.449; 6.13.2 247n.352, 267n.38, 271n.55; 6.13-6.15 223; 6.14.1-4 161;



*(Hysmine & Hysminias, cont.)*

6.14.5–6 276\*; 6.14.5–7 161; 6.14.7 268n.41, 274, 275\*, 276n.81; 6.15 60, 161; 6.15.2 267n.39; 6.15.2–3 275\*; 6.15.3 267n.39; 6.15.4 276\*; 6.16 162n.447; 6.16.2 140; 6.16.3 161–162\*; 6.16.5 247n.352; 6.17.1 67; 6.17–18 66–67\*, 194n.142; 6.18 55, 109, 215, 264\*; 6.18.1 67, 118n.256

7.1 223; 7.1.1 62, 62n.51; 7.3.2 247n.352; 7.4.2 268n.42; 7.5.2 268n.40; 7.7 192, 215, 213n.239; 7.7.2 94n.164, 153n.409; 7.7.2–3 214\*; 7.7–16 192; 7.8 215; 7.8.1 94; 7.8.2 255n.396; 7.8–18 215n.242; 7.9 192n.131, 215; 7.9.3 114n.245, 134\*; 7.9.6 277–278\*; 7.10 192n.131; 7.10.3 109\*; 7.10.5 68n.62\*, 69n.64, 118n.256, 214\*; 7.11 192n.131, 215; 7.11.4–5 215–216\*; 7.11.5 114n.245; 7.12.1–2 216\*; 7.12.1–3 192; 7.12.3 53, 245n.341\*; 7.12.3–4 163, 216\*; 7.12.4 217n.247, 218n.253, 265; 7.13.1 162n.451, 216, 267n.38, 271n.55; 7.13.2 183n.82, 192, 217\*, 217n.248; 7.14.1 218n.253, 278\*; 7.14.3 183n.82, 218n.253, 217\*; 7.15 245; 7.15.1 218n.253; 7.15.2 153\*, 187, 217\*, 217n.249; 7.16 219; 7.16–9.5 56; 7.17.1 267n.39; 7.17.7 65\*; 7.17.9 109n.222, 114n.245; 7.17.11 279\*; 7.18.2 267n.39; 7.18.3 114n.245; 7.18–19 55, 95, 109, 109n.223, 194n.142; 7.19 65\*, 65n.57\*, 68\*, 109\*, 114n.245, 117, 245n.343

8.1–8.9 122n.271; 8.1–9.8 118; 8.4 60; 8.7 116, 198, 221; 8.7.1 140n.344, 198, 221n.268\*, 267n.32; 8.7.2–5 49; 8.7.5 118n.256; 8.8.1 117; 8.8.2 137; 8.8.2–3 60; 8.9.2 117\*; 8.9–8.10 122n.267; 8.10 64; 8.10.1–2 116\*; 8.10.3 117\*; 8.11 281; 8.11.1 53\*, 116, 117, 118; 8.11.2 54n.27\*, 55, 119n.257, 150, 150n.401\*, 247n.352, 248n.357\*, 265\*; 8.12.1 119n.257, 150; 8.12.2 119n.257, 267n.38; 8.12–14 81n.103; 8.12–8.15.1 60; 8.13 64, 83, 139n.337; 8.13.1 57n.41, 114n.247; 8.13.1–2 116; 8.13.2 118\*; 8.13.3 278n.87\*; 8.13.4 118, 119n.257; 8.13–9.1 57n.42; 8.14.1 150\*, 164, 247n.352;

8.14.1–2 152; 8.14.2 151\*, 267n.38; 8.14.3–4 116\*, 118n.256, 164; 8.14.4 119\*, 119n.257, 132; 8.15.1 114n.247; 8.15.1–2 119\*; 8.15.1–3 119n.257; 8.16.1 137; 8.16.2 119n.257; 8.16.2–3 64; 8.16.4 118\*, 121n.262, 151\*; 8.16.4–8.17 49; 8.17 118n.256, 151; 8.18 49, 116, 157, 198, 232\*; 8.18–21 56; 8.19 69, 117; 8.19.2 57\*; 8.19.3 57; 8.20 151, 152, 164; 8.20.2 119n.257, 151–152\*; 8.20.3 271n.55; 8.20–21 60; 8.21.3 54, 119n.257, 267n.39, 278n.90\*; 8.21.4 57\*; 8.21.4–9.3 69

9.1.2 115; 9.1–9.2.1 58; 9.1–9.3.1 57; 9.2.3–9.3.1 58\*; 9.3.1 53; 9.3.2 59\*, 118n.256; 9.3.2–4 60; 9.3.2–9.4 59; 9.4.1 59, 65, 153n.409, 266\*; 9.4.2 59; 9.4.3 59, 119n.257; 9.4.3–9.5 69; 9.5 59; 9.5.2–3 59\*; 9.5.3 65, 118n.256, 119–120\*; 9.6 120; 9.6.2–3 65\*; 9.6.4 95, 110; 9.7.1 54n.28\*, 118\*; 9.7.2–9.11.1 60; 9.8.1 66, 120; 9.8.1–9.10.2 117; 9.8.2 100\*; 9.8.2–9.10.2 100; 9.8.4 66\*, 118, 120; 9.9 60, 142, 246; 9.9.1 64\*, 203, 252n.386\*; 9.9.2–3 252n.385\*; 9.9.3 120, 219, 252n.386\*, 253n.388\*; 9.10.1 247n.352; 9.11 120n.260; 9.11.3 95, 110, 120n.259; 9.12 150; 9.12.2 100n.187\*, 120n.259; 9.12.2–9.13 100; 9.12–10.8 49; 9.13 64, 83, 139n.337; 9.13.1 118, 120n.259; 9.13.3 118n.256; 9.14.5 120n.259, 122n.267, 122n.271, 158\*, 250; 9.15 281; 9.15.3 120n.259; 9.16 60; 9.16.1 120n.259; 9.16.1–9.20 117; 9.16.2 120n.260; 9.16.3 121n.261; 9.16.4 121\*, 121n.261, 231\*; 9.16.5 115n.250, 120n.260; 9.16–9.21.1 60; 9.17.1 120n.260; 9.17.2 246\*; 9.17.2–3 120\*; 9.18.1 121n.261; 9.19 63, 259; 9.19.1 121n.261; 9.20.1 117, 118n.256; 9.20.2 231; 9.21.2–10.4.1 100; 9.21.3 121n.261; 9.21–10.4.1 60; 9.22 63, 121n.261; 9.22.1 135\*, 135n.319; 9.22.3 219n.259\*, 255n.396; 9.22.3–9.23 259; 9.22.5–9.23 148–149\*; 9.23 152, 160, 255n.394, 274, 286; 9.23.1 267n.39, 271n.55; 9.23.2 268n.40

(*Hysmine & Hysminias*, cont.)

10.1 259; 10.2 121n.261, 142, 253n.390;  
10.2.2 118n.256; 10.3 177n.54, 198,  
200n.169, 235\*; 10.4.1 120n.259; 10.4.2  
109\*, 236\*; 10.4.2-3 60; 10.5 60, 61\*, 69;  
10.5.1 62n.49; 10.5.2 62n.49, 83n.110;  
10.6 62; 10.6.1 62\*; 10.6.2-4 121n.262,  
151; 10.6.2-5 49; 10.6.3 153n.409; 10.6.4  
151\*; 10.6.5 152, 267n.39, 271n.55;  
10.6.7 118n.256; 10.7 69; 10.7.3  
120n.260; 10.7.3-8.3 121\*; 10.7-8 60;  
10.8 49, 150, 151; 10.9 120, 121; 10.9.3  
62-63\*, 117; 10.9.3-10.15 62; 10.10.3  
267n.39; 10.10.6 255n.396; 10.10.10  
114n.247; 10.10.11 121n.263; 10.10.12  
121n.263, 122n.267; 10.10.13 117n.255;  
10.10.14 117n.255; 10.10-13 161;  
10.11.11 117n.255; 10.11.2 267n.39;  
10.11.4 115\*; 10.12 259; 10.12.2  
268n.40; 10.12.3 115n.250; 10.12.5  
117n.255; 10.13.3 54; 10.13.5 117; 10.14  
121n.263; 10.14 122; 10.14.2-15.2 163\*;  
10.14-15 218n.255; 10.15.1 57n.41;  
10.16-10.18.1 60; 10.17.2 247n.352;  
10.17.3 247n.353; 10.18.2 95\*

11.1.1 95, 117; 11.1.2 247n.353; 11.2.2  
247n.353; 11.2-10 139n.337; 11.2-11.17.1  
60; 11.3-10 64; 11.4.3 121n.264; 11.4.5  
131; 11.5.1 121n.264; 11.5.3 267n.38;  
11.5.4 121n.264; 11.7 121n.264; 11.9.5  
121n.264; 11.10.2 121n.264; 11.11.1 49\*,  
138n.334, 173n.348, 248; 11.11-12  
247n.349; 11.12.2 247\*, 247n.352,  
247n.353; 11.12.3-4 250n.369; 11.12.4  
153n.409; 11.13 67n.60; 11.13.16  
139n.337; 11.13.1-14.1 233\*; 11.13.2  
114n.247; 11.13.2-14.1 64\*; 11.13-16 49,  
64, 150; 11.14.1 109; 11.14.2 240n.314\*;  
11.15.1 138n.332; 11.15.5 138n.332;  
11.16.1 121n.264, 220\*; 11.17 221;  
11.17.1 95\*; 11.17.2 84\*, 84n.111, 101;  
11.18.2-11.19 60; 11.18.2-20.1 68-69\*;  
11.19 66, 74; 11.19.1 69; 11.19.3  
118n.256; 11.19.4 72n.66\*, 153n.409,  
268n.42; 11.20 74-75\*; 11.20.1 77,  
121n.265\*; 11.20.2 77n.87; 11.20-23  
90n.136; 11.21 158; 11.21.2 121n.265;  
11.21.3 75n.78\*, 113n.241; 11.21.4

75n.79\*; 11.21-22 135; 11.22.1-2 158\*;  
11.22.2 76n.81, 247n.352; 11.22.3  
75n.80\*, 247n.352; 11.22.4 77, 135,  
247n.352; 11.22.4-23.3 75-76\*; 11.23 88;  
11.23.1 132; 11.23.1-2 77; 11.23.3  
76n.81, 78, 88, 135, 247n.352, 248n.355

*Achilles Tatius,*  
*Leukippe & Kleitophon*

1.1 212n.228; 1.1.1 179; 1.1.1-3 178\*;  
1.1.2 179; 1.1.3-6 210; 1.1.3-13 178;  
1.1.4 210\*; 1.1.13 203, 234n.295\*;  
1.1.13-1.2.1 202\*; 1.2.1 184n.91, 194,  
203\*; 1.2.1-1.3.1 179\*; 1.2.2 247n.352,  
248n.357\*; 1.2.3 181, 182n.78; 1.2-13  
188, 193; 1.3 178; 1.3.1 180, 265n.25;  
1.3.4 188, 196, 194n.141, 197n.154,  
225n.274; 1.4.2 22n.68; 1.4.3 194, 251\*;  
1.4.4 22n.68, 181n.70, 199\*, 199n.162,  
230n.287, 282n.114; 1.5.1-2 227\*; 1.5.2  
230; 1.5.3 199n.164; 1.5.5 198, 231\*;  
1.5.5-6 198\*; 1.5.6 25n.82, 28n.98; 1.5.7  
231\*, 233; 1.6.1 195; 1.6.2 281n.112;  
1.6.2-3 195\*; 1.6.2-4 199n.165; 1.6.4-5  
195\*; 1.6.5 194n.141, 196; 1.6.6 181n.66;  
1.7.1 257n.407\*, 257n.408; 1.7-9 257;  
1.7-11 239; 1.7-14 259; 1.8.2 68n.62;  
1.9.1 186; 1.9.4 28n.98, 181n.70, 199,  
200, 230n.287; 1.9.5 205n.191; 1.9.6  
240n.316\*; 1.9.7 113n.240, 257\*; 1.10  
257; 1.10.1 181n.66, 183\*, 257\*, 273;  
1.12.1 183\*; 1.12-14 173n.34, 239,  
257n.408; 1.15 180, 194, 197; 1.15.1-8  
210; 1.15.2 209-210\*; 1.15.4 209\*;  
1.15.7-8 102n.195; 1.15-19 239; 1.16.1  
198\*; 1.16.6 181n.66; 1.16-17 257; 1.16-  
19 198; 1.17 235n.299; 1.17.3-5 177n.54,  
235\*; 1.18.1-2 140n.344, 198n.160,  
221n.268; 1.19 235; 1.19.1-2 252n.383;  
1.19.2 199\*; 1.19.3 199n.163

2.1 239; 2.2.2 269\*; 2.2-3 239; 2.3.2  
188n.115; 2.3.3 99n.179\*, 239n.313; 2.4.2  
173; 2.4.4 263\*; 2.5.1 253\*, 254; 2.6  
253\*, 254; 2.7 254, 255; 2.7.4-7 280; 2.7-  
8 254; 2.9 230, 258; 2.9.2 231; 2.10 257,  
258; 2.11.1 239n.311, 239n.313; 2.12.2-3



*(Leukippe & Kleitophon, cont.)*

222\*; **2.13–18** 173; **2.14** 198n.159; **2.14.4** 269n.49; **2.14.7** 274n.73\*; **2.15.1** 175n.43; **2.17.1** 175n.43; **2.19.1** 113n.240, 239n.311, 239n.313; **2.19–25** 257; **2.21** 277n.82; **2.21–22** 173, 198; **2.22.2** 281n.112; **2.23** 188, 196, 194n.141, 197n.154, 225n.274; **2.23.4–6** 224\*; **2.24** 207n.202; **2.24.1–4** 224–225\*; **2.28.1** 247n.352; **2.31.2** 173n.36, 187\*; **2.32** 192; **2.32.2** 213n.239; **2.32–3.1** 215; **2.33** 192; **2.33–38** 215n.243; **2.34** 173n.35, 192; **2.34.7** 187n.107; **2.34–38** 257n.408; **2.35** 192; **2.35–38** 192; **2.36** 192n.130; **2.37** 192n.130; **2.37.5** 113n.240, 250n.370; **2.37.7** 176; **2.38** 192n.130

**3.1–4** 192; **3.1–5** 215; **3.3.1** 27n.89; **3.5.4** 27n.89, 215\*, 219; **3.6–8** 89n.134, 188, 188n.112, 193; **3.7.9** 247n.352; **3.7–8** 212n.228; **3.8** 277n.82; **3.8.1** 247n.352; **3.10.3** 68n.62; **3.14.2** 187n.107; **3.15** 218; **3.15.5–6** 284n.127; **3.15–22** 258; **3.17–18** 284n.127; **3.19–22** 173n.34, 187n.108

**4.1** 188; **4.1.3–7** 188n.113; **4.1.4** 36n.151, 194n.141, 196; **4.1.5–8** 194n.141, 196; **4.2–5** 198; **4.3.1–2** 198\*; **4.4.4** 174n.41; **4.4.7** 269n.49; **4.8.3** 230n.287; **4.12.1** 269n.49; **4.15** 173n.34; **4.18** 173

**5.1** 241n.320; **5.2.3** 188\*, 243n.331\*; **5.3.4–8** 188, 188n.112, 193; **5.3–7** 173; **5.4.1–2** 194; **5.5** 194; **5.5.1** 198\*; **5.5.4** 247n.352; **5.7** 218; **5.7.4** 245; **5.8** 173n.34; **5.8.2** 239\*; **5.9–10** 173n.34, 187n.108; **5.13.3** 199n.164; **5.13.3–4** 200, 282n.114; **5.13.4** 181n.70, 199n.167, 230n.287; **5.15.6** 113n.240; **5.16.3–4** 214\*; **5.16.3–6** 69n.64; **5.17.3–4** 258; **5.18** 187, 251n.374, 259n.414; **5.18.3–4** 252n.385\*; **5.18.4** 219n.258\*; **5.18.4–5** 253n.387; **5.18.5** 253n.390; **5.18.6** 252n.386\*, 253n.387; **5.23** 188n.111; **5.25.4–5.26** 183–184\*; **5.25.6** 207n.202; **5.26.3** 113n.240; **5.26.10** 113n.240; **5.27** 176n.51; **5.27.4** 183

**6.10.4** 68n.62; **6.13.2** 234\*; **6.16.5** 250–251\*; **6.22** 251n.373

**7.2.26** 207n.202; **7.7–9** 218n.255; **7.11–12** 218n.255; **7.12.3** 175n.43, 188n.111

**8.1.2** 249n.363; **8.4.3–4** 186; **8.5** 186, 187, 246n.347; **8.5.2–5** 186\*; **8.5.4** 186\*; **8.5.4–6** 244, 247; **8.6** 220; **8.8.8** 284; **8.8–11** 218n.255; **8.9.1** 218n.254; **8.9.7** 284\*; **8.10.10** 175n.43; **8.12** 140n.344, 156, 198n.160, 221; **8.13.2** 221\*; **8.13–14** 220; **8.14** 140n.344; **8.14.2** 221\*; **8.15.3** 187\*, 187n.107, 246\*, 248; **8.16** 173, 187n.108; **8.17–18** 173, 187n.108; **8.19.3** 189\*

## B. Other writers

A&K: see below, Konstantinos Manasses

Aeschylus

*Eumenides*

567–568 226n.275, 268n.41

*Prometheus*

61–62 275n.77

67–68 275n.77

76–77 275n.77

79–80 268n.41, 275n.76, 276n.81

*Aith.*: see below, Heliodoros

Anacreon

6. 5–7 West 281n.111

*Anth.*: see below, *Greek Anthology*

Aristophanes

*Nubes*

1–2 72n.66, 268n.42

408 48n.9

*Plutus* 600 268n.42

fr. 216 269n.46

Aristotle

*De divinatione per somnia*

463a 110n.228

*Ethica Nicomachea*

1106b36 104n.204

1142b 24 231n.289

1166a31–32 162n.445

*Parva naturalia*

459b–461a 110n.228

*Problemata* 957a 236n.303

Balsamon, Theodoros

epigr. 13 18n.43

Basilakes, Nikephoros

*Progymnasmata*

26.3 211n.221

26.17–20 213n.234

51.32–33 205n.188\*

C&K: see below, Chariton

Chairemon

fr. 2, *Tragicorum Graecorum*

*Fragmenta* vol. 1, p. 217 278n.90

Chariton

*Chaireas & Kallirhoe* (C&K)

8.1.3 181n.72

8.16 191n.125\*

Cicero

*Orator* 3.10 181n.68

*Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*

I, 32 (Zenobius II.1) 278n.91

I, 96 (Zenobius IV.43) 218n.251

I, 195 (Diogenianus I.90) 278n.91

I, 314 (Diogenianus VIII.45) 278n.89

II, 220 (Macarius VII.42) 278n.89

II, 450 (Apostolius VIII.71) 278n.93

II, 474 (Apostolius IX.59a) 278n.89

D&C: see below, Eugenianos and Longus

Daphnopates, Theodoros

Κωνσταντίνῳ Πορφυρογεννήτῳ τῷ

φιλοχρίστῳ βασιλεῖ

ll. 12–13 182n.79\*

Demetrius

*On Style* (Περὶ ἐρμηνείας)

112–113 261n.3

113 261n.3\*

*Digenis Akritas* (Grottaferrata version)

4.209 281n.108

*Eph.*: see below, Xenophon Ephesios

Eugenianos, Niketas

*Drosilla & Charikles* (D&C)

1.77–108 211n.219

1.77–115 101

2.125–143 35n.146

2.169–185 219n.261

2.245–246 219n.261

2.284–287 212n.231

3.142–143 281n.111

4.135–148 235n.299

6.416–419 266n.31

6.589 219n.261

6.592 219n.261

8.151–160 36n.151

8.242 266n.31

9.207–211 228n.283



Euripides

*Alcestis* 512 267n.39

*Hecuba*

72 267n.38, 284n.130

96 267n.38

228 267n.38

245 267n.38

255 267n.38

280–281 267n.38

375–376 267n.38

398 267n.38

413 267n.38

607–608 267n.38

612 267n.38

752 267n.38

787 267n.38

839 267n.38

886–887 226n.278, 267n.38,  
284n.128

981–1046 226n.279, 267n.38,  
284n.129

1035 284n.129\*

1226–1227 267n.38

*Heraclidae* 830–831 268n.41

*Hippolytus*

219 267n.39

415–416 152, 267n.39

439 125n.279\*, 267n.39, 270\*

534 111n.232

828 267n.39

*Medea*

54–55 267n.39

265–266 267n.39

408–409 126n.280, 267n.39

*Orestes* 982 211n.227

*Phoenissae*

355 267n.39, 275n.79\*

469 267n.39, 275n.80

618 267n.39

*Rhesus* 988–999 268n.41

*Supplices* 826–827 267n.39

Eustathios of Thessalonike

*Comm. ad Hom. Il.*

on *Il.* 8.19 211n.227

*Comm. ad Hom. Od.*

on *Od.* 14.350 28n.97

Geometres, John

Ἐπιστολὴ κήπου ἐκφραστική  
8.8 and 8.23–29 182n.80

Ἑτέρα εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν κήπον  
13.11–24 101n.191

*Greek Anthology*

5.9 254n.392

5.22 111n.232

5.85 219n.261

5.236 219n.261

5.241 219n.261

9.203 26–27\*

Gregory of Nazianzus

*Orationes*

43.64, PG 36. 581B 104n.205\*

Gregory of Nyssa

*Homiliae*

V 138.3–6 282n.114

VII 218.17–219.1 282n.114

Heliodoros

*Aithiopika*

1.1 82n.106

4.1.1 175n.43

4.2.1 175n.43

4.3.3 175n.43

4.4.4 25n.82, 28n.98

4.5.5 175n.43

7.3.3 175n.43

7.11.7 122n.268

7.19.8 122n.268

8.9.10 175n.43

9.20.2 175n.43

10.4.4 175n.43

10.7–8 221n.267

10.8 220n.265

10.16.3 175n.43

10.25.1 175n.43

Hermogenes

*Peri ideon*

2.4, Spengel II 358 181n.67

2.4, Spengel II 357–364 181n.74

Herodotus

1.23–24 144n.370

Hesiod

*Erga*

24 58n.44

83–89 276

518–519 271\*

519 265n.21

519 271

(Hesiod, *Erga* cont.)

545–546 271n.56, 277n.85

719–720 270, 273n.67

734 277n.85

*Theogonia* 120–122 205n.188

Hippocrates

*De Alimentis*

39 148n.391\*, 273n.68

Homer

*Iliad*

1 217n.248

1.14 164n.457

1.96 164n.457

1.500 267n.38

2.24 96, 271n.53\*, 271n.54,  
273n.66

2.61 271n.54

2.683 265n.19

3.57 226n.277

3.75 265n.19

3.157 126, 271n.54

3.258 265n.19

4.350 217n.249

5.785–786 164n.456

7.180 265n.18

7.219–223 265n.20

7.282 272\*

7.293 272\*

8.19 211n.226

8.282 and 293 234n.296\*

9.409 153n.410, 187n.106,  
217n.249

9.447 265n.19

11.46 265n.18

14.214–221 265n.22

22.126 271n.54, 278n.94

*Odyssey*

1.64 217n.249

1.170 265n.24

3.305 265n.18

5.296 265n.21

7.112–131 89n.135, 100

9.82–102 264n.17

10.325 265n.24

12.41–45 67n.61

14.187 265n.24

15.264 265n.24

19.105 265n.24

19.163 271n.54, 278n.94

19.386–505 281n.108

19.535–581 236n.303

24.298 265n.24

*Hymni Homerici*

7.53 (To Dionysus) 144n.370

Iamblichos

fr. 4 Habrich 111n.232

Kallistratos

*Imagines*

1.5 85n.117

2.4 85n.117

3.5 85n.117

11.2 273n.65\*

Kataskepenos

*Life of Saint Cyril Phileotes*

2.6 28n.98

5.9 204n.186, 254n.392

10.2 28n.98

29.2 104n.206\*

36 204n.186\*

*Life of Saint Xenophon*

PG 114.1021 27n.89

PG 114.1024 27n.89

*Life of St Irene, Abbess of Chrysobalanton*

53c 196n.151

Longus

*Daphnis & Chloe (D&C)*

prooem. 3 77n.87\*

1.1 179n.58

1.1.1 193n.136

1.22.4 181n.73

1.25–26 181n.73

2.3–7 204\*, 210n.217, 212

2.5.2 184n.91

2.7.1 181n.73, 248n.357\*

2.7.1–3 207\*

2.7.2 208

2.34 220n.265

3.2.2 175n.43

3.34.2–3 212\*

4.2 210n.214\*, 210n.217,  
210n.218, 212

Lucian

*Zeuxis* 2 278n.91

*M&P*: see below, *Metiochos* &  
*Parthenope*



## Manasses, Konstantinos

- Aristandros & Kallithea (A&K)*  
 fr. 8, 21, 64, 95, 117 35n.146  
 fr. 21 36n.153, 198n.160  
 fr. 24 99n.179\*

## Manganeios Prodomos

- poem 7 196n.150  
 poem 45, *Eis τὸν ἔρωτα* 28n.94

## Martial

- Epigrams* 1.52 and 1.53 261n.1

## Metiochos &amp; Parthenope (M&amp;P)

- column 2, 59–60 205n.192\*  
 column 2, 60–62 205n.191\*, 240  
 n.316  
 column 2, 69–71 205n.193

## Musaeus

- Hero and Leander*  
 55–57 22n.68  
 92–98 22n.68

## New Testament

- Luke* 7.36–50 281n.107  
*John* 13.3–20 281, 281n.107

## Nonnus

- Dionysiaca*  
 3.131–179 236n.302  
 3.142–143 236n.302\*  
 3.169–179 102n.196, 236n.302

Old Testament (*Septuagint*)

- Genesis* 39 280n.104  
*Psalms*  
 17.13 274n.72\*  
 138.7–10 254n.392  
*Song of Songs (Cant.)*  
 1.11 279n.99\*  
 4.11 279  
 4.12 279n.101  
*Isaiah* 1.8 280n.104\*

## Philostratus, Flavius

- Lives of the sophists* 1.481 20n.52\*

## Philostratus "the Elder"

- Imagines*  
 1, prooem. 4–5 85n.117  
 1, prooem. 5 129n.292

## Philostratus "the Younger"

- Imagines*  
 prooem. 7 85n.117

## Photios

*Bibliothēke*

- cod. 87 24n.76\*, 26\*  
 cod. 94 26n.94, 219n.258

## Pindar

- Olympian odes* 1.28–29 248n.357

## Plato

- Gorgias* 523a 248n.357

*Phaedrus*

- 229a–230c 181n.65  
 242b–243d 181n.72  
 249d 181n.73  
 251b–c 181n.70, 181n.71  
 255b–d 181n.70, 181n.71  
 255d 181n.73  
 259a–c 181n.73  
 278a6–7 181n.66

*Protagoras*

- 315b 183n.81\*  
 339a–342a 270n.52

*Republic*

- 2.376e–377a 248n.357  
 5.450b 248n.357\*  
 8.569b–c 278n.88\*  
 9.571c, 574d, 576b 236n.303

*Symposium*

- 178c and 195b 184n.90  
 189c–193d 157n.432  
 208e1–209e4 181n.66  
 210a7–8 181n.66  
 210c1–3 181n.66  
 210d4–6 181n.66

*Theaetetus* 153c 211n.227*Timaeus* 45b–46a 110n.228

## Plutarch

*Amatorius*

- 749a 181n.67, 182n.78  
*Coniugalium praecepta* 141a 218n.251  
*De adulatore et amico* 53b 162n.445  
*De amicorum multitudine*  
 93e 162n.445

*De E apud Delphos*

- 388e–389c and 393a–c 128n.286

*De sollertia animalium*

- 984b–985c 144n.370

*Lacaenarum apophthegmata*

- 241.16 278n.93

*Life of Demetrius* 27 196n.151

(Plutarch, cont.)

*Septem sapientium convivium*

160f–163d 144n.370, 234n.296

164d 272n.62\*

Porphyry

*Life of Pythagoras* 33 162n.445\*

Prodromos, Theodoros

*Rhodanthe & Dosikles (R&D)*

1.372–404 220n.265

2.120–128 228n.283

2.145–149 228n.283

2.421–431 184n.90

2.434 184\*

3.66–75 36n.151

4.9 159n.436

5.479 159n.436

7.400–445 184n.92

8.191–8.209 35n.146

Prokopios

*De aedificiis* 1.1.27–78 101n.190

Psellos

*Peri Characteron*

50.13–14 186n.104\*

51.18–28 186n.104

*Synkrisis (De Charikleia et Leucippe iudicium)*

1–2 27n.91\*

11–13 24n.76\*

14–16 284n.127

66 23\*

67–69 24\*

67–71 284n.127

84–86 177n.56

91–92 28n.96

Ps.-Lucian

*Amores* 31 182n.78

R&amp;D: see above, Theodoros Prodromos

Sappho

fr.102 278n.95\*

fr.130 135n.317

Sophocles

*Aias*

17 226n.275, 268n.41

132–133 105n.211, 268n.40,

273n.70

293 268n.40

507–508 268n.40

554b 268n.40

811 268n.40

956 217n.247

*Antigone* 944–954 268n.40*Electra* 59–60 268n.40

Suda

A 4695 24n.70

Δ 752 48n.9

H 616 278n.93

I 314 218n.251

Ξ 50 174n.39

X 564 211n.227\*

Symeon the New Theologian

hymn 1, 33–140 281n.113

Synesios

*On Kingship (Περὶ βασιλείας)*

6a–b 133n.310

6c 104n.207, 133\*

Theocritus

*Idylls*

3.20 266, 266n.27\*

3.37 266n.28\*

3.52 278n.95\*

Theophanes Continuatus

327.4–328.2 101n.189, 102n.198

328.21–329.3 101n.189

Theophylact of Ochrid

*Paideia Basilike*

12 134n.312

17 104n.207, 133

25 133n.310

Tzetzes, John

*Allegory on the Iliad*

on Il. 8 211n.227

*Chiliads*

5, hist. 11, 502–511 206n.198

7, hist. 132, 295–301 148n.390

Xenophon Ephesios

*Ephesiaka (Eph.)*

1.1.5 207n.203\*

1.2.2 207n.202

1.3.2 181n.71

1.9.6–8 181n.71

5.15.2 191n.125\*



# General index

- Achilleid* 110n.230, 242n.324  
 Achilles Tatius 19–24, 26–28, 31, 35–36  
 action vs. lack of action 50, 79, 139, 143, 177, 239, 242, 259, 286  
 addressee 52–53, 128–129, 182, 206, 286, *see also* Charidoux  
 Aeschylus 268, 274, 276–277  
 Agapitos, P. A. 18, 34, 40  
*Akathistos* hymn 99  
 Alcuius, *Emblemata* 87n.122  
 Alexios I Komnenos 32, 204  
 Alexiou, M. 16, 40, 91, 92, 137, 139, 146, 147, 150, 160, 166  
 allegory 31–32, 91, 100, 129, 140, 165, 279  
 allusion 16, 67, 77, 86, 87, 89, 96, 103, 142, 144, 148, 156, 262–267  
 amplification 71, 72, 73, 158, 203, 207, 223, 224, 227, 256, 259, 260, 263, 272, 288  
 anagnorismos 59, 65–66  
 analepsis, *see* recapitulation  
 Anna Komnene 17, 33, 36, 185  
*Alexiad* 30, 75n.76, 160n.440  
 anticipation 51, 55, 64–68, 108, 139, 142, 150, 186, 187–189, 223, 242, 287  
 Apollo 50, 53–54, 56, 57, 62, 75, 116, 117, 137, 163  
   and Daphne 49, 157, 231–233  
   priest of 49, 117, 156, 163, 164, 176  
 Aristophanes 29, 157, 218, 268, 269  
 Aristotle 17, 29, 34, 43, 104, 108, 110, 132–133, 165, 185, 186, 194, 223, 285  
 art 55, 102, 104, 123, 127, 130, 132, 135, 186, 201, 210, 238, 242, 251, 252, 287, 289, *see also* work of art  
 artificiality 190–191, 201  
 artistic imagery 18, 78, 130–131, 133, 134–135, 197, 206, 208, 238  
 Artemis 50, 176, 187, 188, 220–221  
   spring of 49, 64, 75, 116, 138, 198, 221  
 Artykomis, *see* space  
 audience  
   of ancient Greek novel 22–23  
   of *H&H* 13, 33, 185, 237, 242, 286, 289  
 Auerbach, E. 43  
 Aulikomis, *see* space  
 Bakhtin, M. M. 37, 42, 141  
 Bal, M. 47, 136, 154, 249  
 Balsamon, Theodoros 12, 18n.43  
 Barnes, D. (*Nightwood*) 41  
 Barth, J. 44n.203  
 Baroccianus MS 76n.81, 78, 185  
 Bartsch, S. 188, 190, 210  
 Basilakes, Nikephoros 12, 16, 30, 92, 112n.238, 170n.24, 208, 212–213, 282n.115  
 Beaton, R. 32, 54, 77, 250, 251  
 Booth, W. C. 81, 146  
 Bremond, C. 39  
 Browning, R. 30  
 Bryennios, Nikephoros 18  
   *Hyle Historias* 30  
 Canons of the council of Trullo 175n.44  
 Cervantes 91  
 characterisation 133, 147, 154–165, 248–260  
 Charidoux 52, 89, 128, 152, 154, 180, 182, 286  
 Chariton (*Chaireas & Kallirhoe*) 19, 25n.81, 149n.396, 171–172, 174, 177n.53, 181, 190n.125, 242, 243, 246n.345, 248n.359, 255  
 chastity test 49, 97, 116, 138, 171, 177, 219–222  
 Chatman, S. B. 79–80, 84, 87  
*Christos Paschon* 30, 282n.115  
 closure 74–78, 154, 189–191  
   infratextual 94  
 codex Thebanus deperditus 25n.81  
 commentary  
   as text-type 79, 87–90, 193  
   authorial commentary 87–88, 152–153, 186–187, 239, 272–273  
 Conca, F. 45  
 Cupane, C. 17, 33, 111, 204

- Daphneopolis, *see* space  
 Daphnopates, Theodoros 182  
 Demetrius 261  
 description 201, 248  
   as text-type 79, 84–87, 192–194, 287  
   as opening of novel 178–180  
   of narrative system 46, 47  
 development and maturity 129, 136,  
   159, 165, 238, 240, 246, 248, 287, 288  
*Digenes Akritas* 12, 28, 132n.305,  
   281n.108  
 digression 49, 51, 173, 189, 193, 197–  
   200, 201  
 dinners 59, 60, 99, 100, 138, 176, 206,  
   227n.282, 227–230  
 division  
   of *H&H* into books 93–94  
   of *H&H* into parts 92–93, 200  
   of *L&K* into parts 200  
 dolphin 64, 143, 144, 233–234  
 doubling 50, 51, 56–63, 72, 73, 74,  
   100, 110, 142, 150, 158, 189, 199,  
   210, 287  
 drama 78, 247–248, 285, *see also*  
   tragedy  
   dramatic effect 153, 197, 218, 265  
 dreams 60, 63, 65, 66–68, 73, 74, 82,  
   91, 92, 97, 103, 105–110, 112, 117,  
   122, 123, 125, 152, 159, 161, 165,  
   185, 188–189, 194–197, 224–227,  
   284–285, 286, 287, 288  
   as repetitive device 70, 72  
   function of 55, 142, 144  
   on textual level 84–85, 142  
 ekphrasis 21, 28n.96, 34, 36, 41, 55, 63,  
   80, 82n.106, 85–87, 89, 90, 98–100,  
   101–103, 105, 107n.214, 115n.250,  
   126–127, 129, 130, 134, 135, 139,  
   142, 178–180, 182, 185, 188, 191,  
   193–194, 197, 200, 202–203, 204,  
   206, 213n.236, 236n.302, 238, 240,  
   241, 251–252, 267n.34, 285, 287–288  
 Eliot, T. S. 41  
 ellipsis 83, 87, 93, 138, 153  
 emotional–personal 30, 50, 90–92, 138,  
   153, 197, 201, 238, 245–246, 249,  
   288, 289  
 epic 73, 74, 95–96, 170n.22, 265, 287,  
   *see also* Homer  
 epistolography 52–53, 101n.191, 153,  
   180, 182n.80  
 Eros, *see also* love and sexuality  
   in ancient literature 168, 178–179,  
     182n.78, 184, 185, 202n.179, 204,  
     205–208, 285–286  
   in the 12th century 30, 34, 92, 208,  
     282  
   as central motif or theme 35, 50, 52,  
     98, 123, 132, 153, 191, 287  
   iconography–imagery of 16, 17, 35,  
     103–105, 132–133, 148, 202–208,  
     211, 212–213, 265, 282  
   in dreams and paintings 52, 55, 64–  
     69, 70, 72, 86, 98, 103–109, 123,  
     144, 197, 212  
   servitude to 63, 75, 77, 111–114,  
     117–119, 120–123  
   discussion of 127–128, 130–131,  
     183–184  
   erotic imagery 17, 97–98, 99, 214–  
     215, 255, 264–265, 279, 281–282  
 ethopoeia 21, 90, 142, 165, 200,  
   205n.188, 211n.221, 212–213,  
   282n.115  
 Eugenianos, Nikephoros (*Drosilla &*  
*Charikles*) 11, 15, 16, 17, 35–36,  
   97n.173, 101, 184–185, 202n.179,  
   208n.208, 212, 220n.263, 227n.282,  
   266  
 Euripides 125, 149, 150, 152, 218, 267,  
   270, 271, 275, 284  
 Eurykomis, *see* space  
 Eustathios Boilas 36  
 Eustathios of Thessalonike 12, 28, 29,  
   206n.194  
 Eustratios of Nicaea 110n.227, 185  
 exegete 105, 129, 131, 162, 182, *see*  
   *also* Kratisthenes  
*Fablel dou Dieu d'Amors* 17n.34,  
   109n.223, 110n.230, 215n.242  
 flirtation 59, 60, 63, 81–82, 121, 126,  
   160, 161, 227–231, 253–255  
 footwashing 59, 280–281  
 Forster, E. M. 39, 154  
 fountain 98, 101–103, 269  
 Frank, J. 41–42  
 Fusillo, M. 39, 40



- garden 52, 60, 86, 89, 97–103, 114,  
122, 123, 135, 141, 144, 176, 180,  
182, 193–194, 209–213, 252, 263–264,  
269, 285, 287
- Genette, G. 39, 40, 46, 47, 78, 83, 84,  
136, 145, 168–169
- genre 29, 48, 50, 79, 92, 97, 123, 131,  
140, 155, 156, 160, 169–170, 171–  
173, 174, 191  
generic allusion 263–265  
mixis of genre 29, 53, 149, 154, 186,  
288
- Geometres, John 101, 182, 213
- Gigante, M. 16, 261, 286
- Greek Anthology* 26, 35, 36, 279
- Gregory of Corinth 28
- Gregory of Nyssa 279n.99, 281–282
- Greimas, A. J. 39
- Hägg, T. 38, 40, 137, 146, 192
- hagiography 25, 27, 28, 34, 92, 100,  
144n.371, 195n.147, 196n.151
- Heliodoros (*Aithiopika*) 15, 19–28, 31,  
35–36, 44n.201, 48, 50n.15, 91n.148,  
94n.160, 96, 122, 159n.436, 170, 171–  
172, 174, 176n.52, 183n.83, 188,  
202n.179, 220n.262, 238, 258n.413
- Hellenes and Philhellenes 122, 176n.52
- Herodotus 218, 261
- Hesiod 218, 265, 267, 270, 271, 272,  
276, 277
- High Modernism 41–42, 91
- Hippolytus, Hysminias as 125, 152, 207
- historiography 25n.80, 40, 75, 77n.87,  
78, 190n.125, 244
- Homer 29, 31n.123, 41, 91n.143, 95–  
96, 100, 169, 211, 217–218, 261, 263–  
264, 265, 267, 270–271, 272, 278, *see*  
*also* epic
- homonymity 53, 156–159, 232–233,  
287
- Hunger, H. 16, 18, 34, 43, 91, 102, 111
- Hysmine & Hysminias*  
authorship 12, 18  
dating 12–13, 18  
manuscripts 13, 94n.160, *see also*  
*Baroccianus and Laurentianus*
- imitation 14, 23–24, 35, 38, 168–169,  
261, 286, 288–289, *see also* mimesis
- imperial  
imagery–iconography 104, 111, 133,  
203–204, 205, 207, 213, 282  
milieu and patronage 18, 30–31, 33,  
148, 154, 185, 237, 289
- innovation and originality 29–31, 166–  
167, 286
- interpretation  
of dreams and omens 110, 223  
of narrative 47, 48  
of paintings 86, 87, 104, 127, 130,  
131, 132, 134, 148, 194  
misinterpretation 131, 132, 133, 147,  
148
- inversion 71, 73, 175, 177, 251, 253,  
256, 259, 260
- irony 44, 148–149, 162, 163, 218, 222,  
238, 245, 260, 288
- Italikos, Michael  
*Lament on the death of his partridge*  
85n.115
- Italos, John 185
- Jakobson, Roman 39, 42  
Jakobson's poetic principle 42n.193
- James, H. 39
- Jauss, H. R. 37
- Jeffreys, E. 18, 45
- Jenkins, R. 43, 166
- Joyce, J. (*Ulysses*) 41, 169
- Judgement of Paris 104, 212–213
- Kallimachos & Chrysorroë* 31,  
100n.185
- Kallistratos 85n.117, 273
- Kassia 149, 288
- Kataskepenos, Nikolaos (*Life of St Cyril*  
*Phileotes*) 28, 104n.206, 204
- Kayser, W. 39
- Kazhdan, A. 16, 44
- Kleinias 171, 173, 176, 183, 192, 199,  
235, 239, 240, 256–258, 259
- Kommenian  
culture and literature 13–14, 28–31  
renaissance 11  
revival of the novel 32–36
- Konstan, D. 249
- Kratisthenes 55, 105, 107, 108, 123–  
126, 127–129, 131, 134, 148, 156,  
161–162, 182, 233, 273–274

- Kristeva, J. 168  
 Krumbacher, K. 15  
 Kustas, G. 44
- Lämmert, E. 39  
 laurel 57, 100, 114–117, 132  
 Laurentianus MS 174  
 Leo the Philosopher 26  
 Lessing, G. E. 41, 42  
 letters 60, 64, 66, 120, 142, 148, 252–253  
*Leukippe & Kleitophon*, *see* Achilles  
 Tatius  
*Life of St Leo of Catania* 27n.89  
 literary theory 36–39  
 Littlewood, A. R. 100, 167  
 Ljubarskij, J. 40  
 Longus (*Daphnis & Chloe*) 19, 35, 52, 77–78, 97n.173, 110n.224, 129n.292, 156, 174, 181, 184, 204, 207–208, 212, 238, 248n.359, 266  
 love 123–128, 175–176, 199–200, 206–207, 213–214, 219, 230, 231, 242, 287, *see also* Eros and sexuality  
 Lucian 29, 212n.228, 244n.335, 278n.91, 283n.125
- MacAlister, S. 17, 110, 185  
 Magdalino, P. 17, 34  
 Makrembolites, Eumathios, *see* Hysmine & Hysminias  
 Manasses, Konstantinos (*Aristandros & Kallithea*) 11, 17, 18, 33, 35–36, 99, 199n.161  
*Chronography (Breviarium Chronicum)* 129  
*Ekphrasis of a palace mosaic* 89n.134, 129n.294  
 Manganeios Prodromos 28, 33, 92, 196, 199n.166, 208, 267n.34  
 Mango, C. 44, 166  
 Manuel I Komnenos 17, 196, 204n.184  
 Manuel Philes 31, 100n.185, 127n.284  
 Maximos the Confessor 25, 28n.98  
 Maximos Holobolos 12  
*mediatrix*, Hysmine as 49, 60, 100, 231  
 Melite 171, 173, 176, 177, 183, 200, 214, 220–222, 253, 256, 258–259  
*Metiochos & Parthenope* 184n.91, 205–206
- Michael of Ephesos 110n.227, 185, 196n.150  
 mimesis 11, 14, 31, 34, 43–44, 145, 166–167, 181, 261, 288–289  
 “auto-mimesis” 73, 195  
 mistress (without name) 49, 63, 118, 120–121, 150–152, 164  
 Morgan, J. R. 21, 172  
 Most, G. 190  
 motif 25, 29, 40–41, 43, 50, 77, 97–123, 129–130, 135, 141–142, 144, 153, 170, 174, 180, 191, 193, 196, 199, 201–237, 241, 277, 279, 283, 285, 287, 289  
 Müller, G. 39  
 Mullett, M. 37, 40  
 Musaeus (*Hero and Leander*) 22
- Nabokov, V. 143n.366  
 naming  
   of characters 155–156  
   of protagonists, *see* homonymity  
   of places, *see* space  
 narrative  
   as text-type 79, 80–84  
   defining the term 47  
 narratology 39–40, 46–48  
 Nonnus (*Dionysiaca*) 22n.63, 97n.173
- omens 222–224, 276  
 opposition 105, 131–134, 141, 149, 151, 152
- Palaiologan  
   renaissance 11  
   romance 12n.2, 31, 40, 86n.121, 137n.327, 140n.341, 206n.200  
 palm 235–236  
 Pantheia 224–225, 226–227  
 Panthia 63, 108, 115, 156, 161, 164, 225–227, 274–276, 284  
 parallel action 49, 139, 142, 143, 147, 150, 173, 186, 187  
 passivity of hero and/or heroine 54–55, 249–251, 256  
 Perry, B. E. 15  
 Philip the Philosopher 25, 183n.83  
 philosophy 52–53, 129, 154, 157, 181–186, 208, 230, 238, 285, 286, 288, *see also* Plato and Aristotle



- Philostratus 20, 85n.117, 129n.292,  
181n.68, 212n.228
- Phokas, John 28
- Photios 24n.76, 26–27, 40n.180, 174,  
177n.56, 218n.251, 219n.258,  
283n.125
- Plato 20, 126n.281, 157, 181–185, 190–  
191, 206, 208, 237–238, 278, 282  
Neoplatonism 211, 264
- Plepelits, K. 17, 140, 279
- Plutarch 53, 132n.307, 182, 196,  
268n.44, 270n.51, 272n.62, 278,  
283n.125
- poetic–lyrical 73, 74, 189, 191, 287  
poetics 78, 168
- point of view 49, 145–154, 155, 243–  
248
- Poljakova, S. V. 16
- Pound, E. (*Cantos*) 41
- processions 56–57, 58, 60–62, 69, 115
- Prodromos, Theodoros (*Rhodante &  
Dosikles*) 11, 15, 17, 18, 28, 29n.105,  
30, 33, 35–36, 44n.201, 90, 112n.238,  
127n.284, 184, 185, 202n.179,  
227n.282  
*Katomyomachia* 30
- progymnasmata 21, 30, 34, 44n.201, 91,  
92, 142, 170n.22, 170n.24, 227n.280
- Prokopios 75n.76, 101n.190
- prolepsis, *see* anticipation
- proleptic function 64, 66, 180n.62,  
188–189, 194, 285
- Propp, V. 39
- Psellos, Michael 17, 23–24, 27,  
29n.103, 30n.112, 40n.180, 44n.201,  
160n.440, 174, 177n.56, 185, 206,  
208, 268n.44, 270n.51  
*Chronography (Historia Syntomos)*  
159n.439  
*Ekphrasis on Eros* 185, 206  
*In Canticum* 279n.99  
*On the golden chain in Homer*  
211n.227  
*Peri Characteron*, *see* index locorum  
*Synkrisis (De Chariclea et Leucippe  
iudicium)*, *see* index locorum  
*Ptochoprodromika* 30
- Quellenforschung* 169, 261–262, 268,  
278
- quotation 16, 87, 96, 125, 134, 144,  
148, 149, 150, 152, 245, 267–279
- realism 91, 102, 159, 160, 165, 244,  
246, 248, 249, 260
- recapitulation 51, 63, 64, 72, 139, 147,  
150, 186–187, 242, 287
- repetition 56, 63, 139, 142, 150, 158,  
160, 187, 200, 271–272, 287  
of time formula 62  
of words 57, 57n.42, 74  
of words and formulas 61
- repetition with variation 50, 51, 64–74,  
106–108, 142
- rhetoric 20–21, 22, 37, 44, 74, 75, 77,  
91, 130, 135, 142–143, 154, 155, 163,  
165, 197, 229, 238, 245, 248, 249,  
260, 287, 289
- Rhodope 48, 49, 59, 63, 120–121, 148,  
150, 156, 161
- Rohde, E. 15
- Roman de la Rose* 16, 17n.34, 101n.189,  
116n.251
- roses 73, 99, 106, 112, 114–117, 130,  
132
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 40
- sacrifice  
of Hysmine to Poseidon 48, 53, 65,  
66, 163, 216–219  
to Zeus 62–63, 66, 102, 161, 222–  
224
- Sappho 135n.317, 278n.95
- Satyros 171, 173, 176, 197–198, 225,  
235, 256, 257–258, 263
- Saussure, F. de 39, 42
- scene and summary 79–83, 192–193
- Schmid, W. 15
- Sebastokratorissa Eirene 33, 129
- Second Sophistic 19–22, 23, 34, 181,  
191
- sexuality 50, 55, 72, 114, 152, 176,  
183, 196, 232, 236, 238, 258, 259,  
260, 264, 285, 287–288, *see also* Eros  
homosexuality 177, 192, 257
- sexual advances 60, 151–152, 160,  
164, 172, 176, 177, 220, 250, 258,  
280
- sexual connotation 71–72, 96, 97–98,  
214, 219, 234, 235–236

- Shklovski, V. B. 39  
 Sirens 67, 68n.62, 214  
 slavery 63, 97, 111–123, 131–132, 134–135, 158–159, 258, 287  
 sleep  
   as structural device 94–96, 201  
   as time marker 94–95, 129, 138  
   insomnia 65, 95, 110, 127, 195, 199  
*Song of Songs* 99–100, 255, 279–280, 285  
 Sophocles 149, 214, 267–268, 273  
 Sophrosyne 72, 105, 119, 131–132, 159  
 space 139–141, 201, 240–241  
   spatiality 40, 55, 73, 79, 84, 141, 142, 144–145, 189, 283, 285, 287  
   spatio-temporal 141–144  
 Stanzel, F. 39  
 Sterne, L. (*Tristram Shandy*) 39  
 story and plot 47  
 style 13, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 134, 142, 143, 147, 148, 241, 245, 260  
 sub-plot 49, 137, 139, 142, 150, 152, 173, 186  
 subversion 44, 222, 283, 288–289  
 Symeon the New Theologian 281  
 Synesios 133–134  
  
 text-types 79–80, 90, *see also* narrative, description, *and* commentary  
 theme 21, 41, 54, 55, 77, 96–97, 123–135, 139, 142, 144, 180, 189, 194, 197, 237–238, 240, 248, 250, 276, 277, 280–281, 283, 284, 287–288  
 Theocritus 190, 266  
*Theophanes Continuatus* 101  
 Theophylact of Ochrid 132–134, 281n.113  
 Thucydides 261  
*Timarion* 29, 282n.115  
 time 136–139, 201, 239–240, *see also* spatio-temporal *and* sleep as time marker  
   chronology 136, 138, 139, 242  
   tempo 80–81, 92–93, 129, 139, 143  
   temporality 41, 79, 84, 136  
 tragedy 29, 34, 148–149, 152, 218, 227, 267, 277, 283–284, 285  
 transtextuality 43, 45, 168–169, 170, 283, 285, 286, 288  
 architextuality 168, 285  
 hypertextuality 39, 166, 168, 183, 184, 208, 212, 223, 237, 238, 260, 263, 266, 268, 269, 278, 283, 285, 286  
 intertextuality 11, 19, 22, 34, 39, 145, 152, 166, 167, 168, 208, 218, 234, 260, 265, 268, 272, 273, 278, 281, 283, 284, 285  
 metatextuality 39, 168, 183, 278  
 paratextuality 78, 94, 168  
 twelve months, description of 55, 86, 103, 126–128, 240, 267  
 Tyche 30, 50, 53–55, 157, 160  
 Tzetzes, John 29, 31n.123, 33, 277n.86  
  
*Vāmiq and 'Adhrā* 205  
 Vidan, I. 41  
 Virtues 55, 86, 104, 130, 131–132, 133, 134, 148, 282  
  
 wedding–marriage 50, 52, 60, 66–69, 74–75, 77, 97, 104, 108–109, 113, 171, 172, 173, 174, 189, 212, 213, 222–223, 253, 258  
 western influence 17, 33–34, 92, 111, 204  
 women 22, 152, 160, 255–256, 275–276, 284, 286  
   misogyny 126, 152  
 work of art  
   the novel as 74, 144, 194, 287, 289  
   *automata* 101–102, 211  
  
 Xenophon of Ephesos (*Ephesiaka*) 19, 171, 174, 177n.53, 181, 207, 242, 243, 255  
 Zumthor, P. 37